DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 372 295 CE 066 930

TITLE	Effective Practices in Community Based Family Literacy: Results of a National Research and Evaluation Project.
INSTITUTION	Association for Community Based Education, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. for Literacy, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	93
NOTE	174p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; *Community Programs; Demonstration Programs; Educational Assessment; Educational Research; Intergenerational Programs; *Literacy Education; Outcomes of Education; *Parent Child Relationship; *Parent Education; Parent Influence; Parent Role; *Parents as Teachers; Prereading Experience; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Improvement
IDENTIFIERS	*Family Literacy

ABSTRACT

A field evaluation of 14 community-based family and intergenerational literacy programs identified the most effective strategies, structures, and approaches to reach and teach the "hardest to reach." Information was collected through 90-minute telephone surveys with program coordinators and/or executive directors. Although different in structural design, the programs had similar philosophies and approaches in improving family and intergenerational literacy. Literacy skills development had the following characteristics: it addressed learners' needs, issues, and interests; it focused on practical application; it was participatory; and it supported parents in assuming and enhancing their roles as children's "first teachers." Life skills and/or parenting education were a critical component of each program. All programs provided supportive services, a nonthreatening learning environment, broad-based and learner-centered literacy education, traditional and innovative nontraditional instructional approaches, and traditional and nontraditional assessment methods. An outcome of the project was recommendations for program improvement in three major areas--education and service delivery, staffing, and overall administration--and for research, policy, and staff development. (The 25-page report is followed by these appendixes: survey; field research protocol, interview process, and interview questions; program case studies and profiles; and sample program documents. Contains 13 references.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FILE COPY

ED 372 295

EFFECTIVE PRACTICES IN COMMUNITY BASED FAMILY LITERACY: RESULTS OF A NATIONAL RESEARCH AND EVALUATION PROJECT

(1993)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This project was made possible by a grant from the National Institute for Literacy.

Association for Community Based Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE 066 930

EFFECTIVE PRACTICES IN COMMUNITY BASED FAMILY LITERACY:

RESULTS OF A NATIONAL RESEARCH AND EVALUATION PROJECT

(1993)

This project was made possible by a grant from the National Institute for Literacy.

Association for Community Based Education
1805 Florida Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009
(202) 462-6333

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is the result of the efforts of many individuals who have contributed to ACBE's work in adult literacy. From the early years of our involvement in the field we were aware of the predominance of women in our member programs, the deep involvements of most of these women in raising and caring for children, and the central role that family and community play in their lives. It is because of them, and their wonderful ways of defining their hopes and aspirations in the context of family and community, that community based family and intergenerational literacy has become such a powerful dynamic process that is both effective and beautiful. No study can capture its essence and full dimension. Those who want a glimpse of it, must commit the time to experience it.

We are deeply appreciative of the students, instructors, staff, board members and administrators of the fourteen programs that participated in this study: for their hospitality, their patience, their care and openness in answering questions, their personal stories, and their flexibility in meeting our demanding schedule. The members of the project's task force (listed at the end of this report) provided valuable guidance in planning the project.

Patricia A. Jackson conducted the study, visited every site and wrote this report. She organized and managed the project with great skill and thoroughness. She showed sensitivity to the perspectives and concerns of the participating organizations and has produced a valuable product. Susan B. Rosenblum, also a member of our Literacy Project staff, provided overall supervision for the project. Sean Kelly coordinated the production of the final report.

Sondra G. Stein's work on evaluation of community based literacy programs provided the inspiration and the tools for this study. Her Framework for Assessing Program Quality: An Approach to Community Based Literacy Program Evaluation contributed to the conceptual basis and defined the approach for program assessment.

Finally, our thanks to Bonnie Freeman, of the National Center for Family Literacy, and Nancy Gaj and Robert Yamashita who provided valuable suggestions on model programs to include in this study.

We hope that this report will at least provide the field with a better understanding of community based family and intergenerational literacy programs. For those interested in more detailed descriptions of the programs that participated in this report, short case studies will become available in the near future.

C. P. Zachariadis
Executive Director
December, 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Executive Summary i

II. Introduction 1

III. Research Methodology 3

Site Selection Process 3

Research Questionnaire and Protocol 5

Field Research and Evaluation 6

IV. Summary of Findings and Program Results 7

V. Elements of Program Effectiveness 8

VI. Improving Existing Program Strategies 13

VII. Program Funding 16

VIII. Problems and Solutions 17

IX. Action Steps for Effective Programs 19

X. Summary and Conclusions 20

XI. Recommendations and Implications for Additional Research,

Policy and Staff Development 21

Research 21

Policy 21

Staff Development 24

XII. Appendices

Appendix A: Project Task Force Listing

Appendix B: Program Survey

Appendix C: Field Research Protocol

Appendix D: Field Research Interview Process

Appendix E: Field Research Interview Questions

Appendix F: Program Case Studies and Profiles

Appendix G: Sample Program Documents

Appendix H: Bibliography

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Community based family and intergenerational literacy programs have drawn from the best traditions and practices of community based education to become effective and successful in several ways: they attract and retain learners from the "hardest-to-reach and hardest-to-teach" populations, they maintain a highly participatory process, they improve skills together with independence, self-reliance and self-esteem, and they engage their students in community improvement and development activities.

This project is a field evaluation of fourteen community based family and intergenerational literacy programs. Project staff used ACBE's Framework for Assessing Program Quality: A Community Based Approach to Literacy Program Evaluation to document elements of program effectiveness. The field study was designed to address two key questions:

(1) What strategies, structures and approaches are most effective in reaching and teaching the "hardest-to-reach?"

(2) What mechanisms will help make existing strategies more effective?

Because more than 90% of participants in these programs receive some form of public assistance, the report also discusses implications of the findings for emerging welfare reform and employment training policy.

The field study focused on a series of research questions designed to evaluate standard practices, methodologies, strategies and outcomes in the following areas:

(A) Program Planning, Evaluation and Improvement;

(B) Learner Achievement;

(C) Improvements in Community Development;

(D) Improvements in Program Quality;

(E) Learner Recruitment, Development and Retention

(F) Staff Recruitment, Development and Retention

(G) Program Management and Fiscal Planning

The fourteen sites included in this study were selected from among twenty-three programs recommended as having a degree of effectiveness and success. Each of the recommended programs were contacted and 90-minute telephone surveys with program coordinators and/or executive directors were conducted. Additional criteria used in selecting sites included geographic and ethnic diversity, a diversity in program models, administrative and funding stability, project participation interest and capacity, and program longevity.

Programs surveyed are located in eleven states and the District of Columbia. Five are in rural areas, twelve serve primarily people of color, and four serve refugees and immigrants. Participants were mainly single, female parents 20-35 years old, mostly the primary caregivers of preschool- and elementary school-aged children, with educational levels between the 4th to 9th grade, and over 90% of them received some form of public assistance. Eight of the programs receive federal and/or state funding. Most provided supportive services, and basic skills enhancement and parenting education.

Project staff conducted one- to two-day site visits at each of the fourteen programs. The visits included individual and group interviews with learners, staff and other participants, observation of instructional and related activities, and review of program documentation records.

The study found that all programs helped learners achieve their educational and personal goals by providing supportive services, a non-threatening learning environment, broad-based and learner-centered literacy education, traditional and innovative non-traditional instructional approaches, commercial and teacher-and student-generated educational materials, traditional and non-traditional assessment methods, concentrated parent-child interaction, and linkages and partnerships with other community based education and service organizations.

An outcome of this project is a set of recommendations for program improvement in three major areas:

(1) Education and Service Delivery

(a) Enhance participatory learning, evaluation and planning strategies by regularly involving learners in decision-making;

(b) Develop learner needs and skills assessment and goal-setting as ongoing processes;

(c) Integrate more "concentrated" child/youth education and development components so programs can effectively evaluate and document their impact on children; and

(d) Provide on-site or geographically accessible quality, affordable child care services.

(2) Staffing

(a) Secure funding to ensure adequate levels of staffing ;

(b) Increase on-site staff planning and administration time;

(c) Obtain resources to support ongoing staff development.

(3) Overall Administration

(a) Work for consistent and multi-year funding;

(b) Maintain and expand partnerships and linkages with other service providers;

(c) Increase learner participation in program outreach and recruitment;

(d) Strengthen the capacity of programs to document what they are accomplishing with participants.

Specific recommendations for staff development, a critical element in improving and maintaining program quality are included in the report. Suggestions are also made for further research.

Finally, the study identified and documented several strategies that seem to be particularly helpful in assisting adult learners on public assistance to achieve their educational and personal goals. This information appears to be particularly useful to the development of a more comprehensive human resource investment policy (including welfare reform, and employment training).

INTRODUCTION

Since the mid 1980s, family and intergenerational literacy have gained national prominence as promising and effective approaches not only in addressing the educational needs of adults, but also in helping break the "cycle of illiteracy" within families. Among the better known actors in this area are The National Center for Family Literacy, which recommends the Kenan Trust Family Literacy Program Model, a modification of Kentucky's PACE (Parent and Child Education) program which promotes parent literacy and career education, child education and development, and daily parent-child interaction, and the Carnegie Library's Read Together Program, which encourages daily family reading, family library membership, and parents' basic skills development. These programs have promoted the concept of "family learning," have become instrumental in establishing program guidelines, and have advocated for the development of new programs to support families educationally.

The rationale for these programs' approach is both simple and compelling: by strengthening the literacy skills of parents, the educational experience and proficiencies of their children will increase. Nevertheless, these programs have not been sufficiently evaluated to provide strong evidence of the effectiveness of what appears to be a theoretically sound concept (i.e., the generational transfer of basic education skills), or that one program model is better than others.

Among community based literacy programs, family and intergenerational literacy are defined and practiced somewhat differently. Although these providers also maintain a strong emphasis on the development of basic skills of parents in part to increase their effectiveness as teachers and supporters of their children, equal attention is given to promoting "family learning" as a tool for social change and community development. Among the practices of community based family and intergenerational literacy programs are:

- Defining literacy within the context of family and community needs, issues and interests;
- Defining "family" broadly to include immediate and extended family members, and significant related and non-related persons;
- Building on the learners' experiences, culture, knowledge and skills; and
- Using participatory learning, program planning and evaluation techniques.

Over the last seventeen years, the Association for Community Based Education (ACBE) has supported and promoted the work of community based educational institutions and organizations throughout the nation. Adult literacy is an important aspect of these programs, and many of them involve the whole family. An important element of ACBE's work has been to help improve program quality and to introduce relevant and effective evaluation tools. With respect to family and intergenerational literacy programs, the

focus has been on the definition of the terms, an understanding of good and exemplary practice, and the creation and testing of program improvement and evaluation tools. The National Literacy Act of 1991 has given strong impetus to this effort for three reasons: (a) it provides for "direct and equitable access" for community based programs to federal support, (b) it requires that programs demonstrate effectiveness, and (c) it focuses on the hardest-to-reach and hardest-to-serve constituencies.

This project, supported with a grant from the National Institute for Literacy, is contributing to this work in significant ways. ACBE has conducted a national field study to research the strategies, structures and approaches that contribute to effective community based family and intergenerational literacy programs. The results of this effort suggest ways to improve existing program methodologies, and provide information on what constitutes quality family and intergenerational literacy practices. Project tasks over a 12-month period included:

(1) Surveying successful community based literacy providers of family and intergenerational literacy programs to identify the most effective approaches and practices in reaching and teaching disadvantaged families;

(2) Testing a framework of self-assessment and peer evaluation for providers of family and intergenerational literacy programs;

(3) Providing technical assistance to selected programs to improve their overall program and enhance effectiveness;

(4) Planning workshops for practitioners to promote the adoption of effective methods, and to disseminate the results of the project; and

(5) Developing a report that describes effective programs, documents practices contributing to effectiveness, describes exemplary methods and approaches, and lists models and curricula worth replicating.

Programs that appeared to be successful in their family and intergenerational literacy work, and that were structured to involve learners in identifying and addressing the true needs, interests, problems and concerns of the learners and their communities, were selected to participate in the project. This report highlights the methodologies and key findings of the field research and evaluation. It describes the research methodology and presents elements of effective family and intergenerational literacy program practices; summarizes program participation results; discusses program funding, common problems and possible solutions; and makes recommendations for additional research and policy development.

Included in the Appendix are brief case studies of each of the sites visited (including program profiles), sample program documents, research instruments, and a listing of project resources and references.

PROJECT RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The project was initiated with the establishment of a Task Force of twelve practitioners in the field of family literacy to help project staff establish key parameters of the project, identify qualities, processes and structures that make community based family and intergenerational literacy programs effective, and identify programs to be considered for project participation (see Appendix A for a list of Project Task Force members).

The Task Force also reviewed ACBE's Framework for Assessing Program Quality: A Community Based Approach to Literacy Program Evaluation and made suggestions on how it could be used to evaluate family and intergenerational programs. The Framework, on which the field evaluation was based, presents a broad-based, comprehensive approach to ongoing program evaluation. It identifies key elements of program success and helps programs distinguish the processes and structures they have in place which contribute to their effectiveness.

The Task Force examined elements of community based family literacy and sought to develop a definition that is relevant and appropriate to the practice of community based providers. These organizations tend to serve economically and educationally disadvantaged persons (many of whom are members of ethnic/racial minorities and live in "extended" families) and promote "family development" as a catalyst for improving community life. This approach thus helps build the capacity of families to enhance their living conditions, address internal issues/problems and participate fully in community life.

The Task Force also identified several operational characteristics considered unique to community based family literacy programs (e.g., being deeply personal to learners, encouraging active participation, respecting and preserving learners' cultural heritages, and building on learners' existing strengths) and suggested that research and evaluation project sites represent a diverse collection of programs in rural and urban areas, with varied service populations, program designs, approaches, practices and methodologies.

Site Selection Process

In identifying exemplary community based family and intergenerational literacy programs for this project, ACBE considered both member and non-member organizations. A list of potential project sites was developed from among ACBE members, programs previously supported by the Association's Minigrant Program, suggestions by the National Center for Family Literacy, project Task Force members, consultants, and others involved with local and national Even Start and Head Start programs.

Initial contacts were made with all suggested programs to ascertain their current status and clarify issues raised during preliminary program description reviews. From this initial research 23 community based programs were identified as showing an adequate degree of effectiveness in operating family and intergenerational literacy programs. These programs were contacted and letters were sent delineating project goals and tasks, introducing the Framework and explaining how it would be used during the field

research, specifying the site selection process, and providing an overview of the field research and evaluation activities.

A survey instrument was developed (see Appendix B) which addressed four site selection criteria areas: geographic and ethnographic characteristics, program specifications (i.e., skills enhancement areas, philosophy, structure, approaches, methods and practices, etc.), program administration and funding stability, and project participation interest and capacity. Consideration was also given to program longevity (i.e., a minimum operational period of two years) as a criterion for selection.

Surveys were conducted by telephone with program coordinators and/or executive directors at each site. Although these 23 programs varied in structure, length of training, and family/intergenerational literacy service focus (i.e., parent-focused, child-focused, parent/child combination, etc.), there were similarities in several critical areas, including how programs defined "family" and family/intergenerational literacy, skills assessment strategies, problems, and techniques for increasing program capacity.

Fourteen community based family and intergenerational literacy programs were selected for participation in the project. They met the criterion of longevity, demonstrated success and effectiveness in serving educationally and economically disadvantaged persons, showed quality of program philosophy, practices and strategies (including responsiveness to specific community needs), and appeared to have the capacity to fully participate in the project. Collectively, the selected sites provided diversity in service populations, geographic locations and program models. Following is a collective profile of the 14 sites and their service populations:

- Five of the programs are located in rural areas, nine in urban areas.
- Twelve of the programs primarily serve persons representing racial and ethnic minorities, including persons of Latino and Asian origins, African and Native Americans.
- All but one of the programs primarily serve single, female parents (approximately 20-35 years old). Many of these women are the primary caregivers of preschool and elementary school aged children, have 4th to 9th grade educations, and receive some form of public assistance.
- Four of the programs serve refugee and immigrant populations, requiring the incorporation of English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction as a major or supplementary educational component.
- All of the programs provide supportive services, and use traditional, nontraditional and learner-centered instructional approaches.
- Nine of the programs provide direct services to parents and children (i.e., joint and separate interventions).

The following programs were selected for the project field research and evaluation:

(1) Bronx Educational Services (Bronx, NY)
(2) Community Action of Hays, Caldwell, and Blanco Counties: Workforce Instructional Network (San Marcos, TX)
(3) The Denver Indian Center (Denver, CO)
(4) Dorcas Place Parent Literacy Center (Providence, RI)
(5) Dover Adult Learning Center (Dover, NH)
(6) The Family Place: Mount Pleasant Site (Washington, DC)
(7) Germantown Women's Educational Project (Philadelphia, PA)
(8) The Neighborhood Institute (Chicago, IL)
(9) The Parent-Child Development Center (West Point, VA)
(10) Penn Community Services (St. Helena Island, SC)
(11) Refugee Women's Alliance (Seattle, WA)
(12) Tacoma Community House: Even Start Project (Tacoma, WA)
(13) Tacoma Community House: Refugee Women's Project (Tacoma, WA)
(14) Whitley County Communities for Children (Williamsburg, KY)

Each site participated in one- to two-day program evaluations conducted by project staff. Most received technical assistance as part of the field research process and identified current and future plans for program development. Full case study reports were prepared on each program, documenting operational histories, curricula and the specific strategies and methodologies which promote effectiveness. (For a description of each project site and family literacy program, see Appendix F).

Research Questionnaire and Protocol

Using ACBE's Framework for Assessing Program Quality, which promotes "program improvement as a continuous process" and encourages programs to examine the processes and structures that contribute to their effectiveness, project staff developed a series of research questions (see Appendix E) designed to evaluate standard practices, methodologies, strategies and outcomes in the following major areas:

- Program planning, evaluation and improvement
- Learner achievement
- Improvements in community development
- Improvements in program quality
- Learner recruitment, development and retention
- Staff recruitment, development and retention
- Program management and fiscal planning

Project staff then developed a research protocol using a participatory evaluation approach, that is, engaging administrators, primary and support staff, learners (adult and youth), board members and partnership agency representatives in the process, and designed an "interview procedure" to ensure that all program participants were informed about the goals of the project, research methodology, and guidelines for individual and group interview processes (see Appendices C and D).

Field Research and Evaluation

The field evaluation was conducted between May and July, 1993. In addition to interviews with program administrators, staff, learners and partnership agencies, the field research and evaluation process incorporated the exploration of each community's needs and the role community organizations played in addressing these needs. Program effectiveness was additionally documented through class observations, and the examination of educational resource materials and documentation systems (e.g., curricula, progress reports, learner files and achievement records, letters, program proposals, etc.). The field study focused on the ways in which learners were involved in the process of program planning and evaluation; participatory practices used to actively engage students in learning; strategies employed to identify and assess learners' goals, needs and achievements; operational problems; and creative approaches to increasing the capacity of programs to serve their communities.

Introductory meetings were held first with executive directors and/or family/intergenerational literacy program coordinators to review the site visit schedule and clarify procedures and restrictions (e.g., at one site, pictures could not be taken of a student who was in a witness protection program).

With the exception of one joint session which included program coordinators, staff and learners, and meetings with administrators and partnership agency staff, interviews were conducted separately with each participant group, allowing project staff to gather data from all principal persons and assess their understanding and awareness of program philosophy, practices and methodologies. Notations of discrepancies in the understanding of program principles and techniques were made by project staff for reference during the "exit interview" with administrators. The "exit process," used to provide technical assistance to the programs, included a delineation of each program's exemplary practices and methodologies, the identification and discussion of operational problems and possible solutions for improvement.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS AND PROGRAM RESULTS

The project proposed to answer the following questions:

(1) What strategies, structures and approaches are most effective in reaching and teaching the "hardest to reach?"

(2) What mechanisms will help make existing strategies more effective?

Findings

Although different in structural design, the 14 programs evaluated have similar philosophies and approaches in improving family and intergenerational literacy. Literacy skills development addresses the needs, issues and interests of learners, focuses on practical application, is participatory, and supports parents in assuming and enhancing their roles as children's "first teachers." Life skills and/or parenting education, a critical component of each program, helps adults improve living conditions and parent teaching skills, solve family problems, become advocates for their children, understand social service and school systems and how to communicate effectively with community support agencies.

Programs provide flexible, non-threatening structures and supportive services (e.g., re-enrollment options, open-entry/open-exit, tutoring, etc.) and develop partnerships to increase their capacity to address the needs of learners. In assessing learner achievement and progress, all of the programs employ traditional and nontraditional methods. Instructional approaches also vary in response to diverse learner skills and needs.

Program Results

In addition to improving reading, writing, oral communication and math skills, adult learners most often cited gains in personal and social development as benefits of their program participation. These include: self-esteem, parenting and problem solving skills, involvement in community activities, and increased comfort with reading to and teaching children. Parenting adults felt that, by promoting the importance of reading and education within their homes, they had become better role models for their children. They reported that family relationships had improved significantly, and that preschool and elementary school-aged children read more and seemed more confident and willing to learn.

ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Because the "hardest to reach and teach" often include persons with special needs, limited educational backgrounds, financial resources and support systems, community-based family and intergenerational literacy programs tend to approach education "holistically." A holistic approach ensures the development of "the total family," addresses all needs, acknowledges and supports learners' goals. Among programs researched, several elements/principles have been most effective in helping learners achieve their goals.

(1) If disadvantaged persons are to experience the full benefit of basic education and skills training programs, barriers to their participation must first be identified and eliminated. This includes counseling and the availability of comprehensive supportive services which address a range of needs (e.g., emergency assistance, housing, child care, transportation, personal counseling and medical care).

Pre-educational counseling is provided to help prospective learners understand their strengths and areas requiring improvement, define personal and family learning objectives, and develop learning "action plans." (See Appendix G for samples of program documents which facilitate learner needs and skills assessments, goal-setting, educational planning and program evaluation.)

For example, at the Parent-Child Development Center, an exclusively family/ intergenerational literacy-oriented facility located in rural Virginia, entering students construct a "personal plan" which directs them to think critically about their needs, support mechanisms already in place to help them accomplish their goals, and how the initial plan can be used to shape long-term development. Thus, from the very beginning, learners are encouraged to "own the educational process" through self-assessment and identification of needed skills, and active participation in goal-setting, learning and decision-making. "Ownership" is also fostered by actively involving learners in program evaluation and planning.

(2) One of the most critical elements in reaching educationally disadvantaged individuals and families is a non-threatening learning environment.

All the sites employ former students and other community residents as tutors, teachers and paraprofessionals and/or involve community residents as volunteers to some degree. The programs are flexible to allow learners to attend to legitimate personal and family needs and emergencies without fear of suspension. They also promote group learning, which fosters socialization, cooperative learning and community building within the classroom. Thus, community based programs accomplish several key objectives: they provide role models for learners, eliminate the program barriers of traditional educational settings, and encourage learners to be supportive of each other in and outside the classroom.

(3) Within exemplary community based family/intergenerational programs, "literacy education" is broad-based and learner-centered.

The enhancement of basic skills is not isolated in the academic arena, but is promoted as a "tool" for parenting and problem solving, promoting social awareness and community action. Thus, participants are encouraged to use their literacy to improve the quality of their lives as well as the lives of their families and other community residents.

At Bronx Educational Services (NY), which has a long history of conducting quality adult literacy programs for persons with little or no reading skills, learners are encouraged to participate in parent organizing groups which address various community issues through the use of public education strategies. Through participation in organizing groups--which often are focused on improving the quality of public school education--parents become more knowledgeable of social conditions which warrant change, increase their self-confidence, reinforce their basic skills, and become visible as community advocates and leaders.

In order to ensure that programs are "meaningful to learners," literacy instruction incorporates or is based on the knowledge and skills needs, interests and concerns of participants. The Germantown Women's Educational Project, which provides ABE and GED classes, counseling and career readiness programs to disadvantaged women in the southwest Germantown section of Philadelphia, accomplishes this by creating processes and structures (e.g. summer planning meetings, representation of former students on the organization's board, etc.) which ensure that learners have input into designing and evaluating class topics and activities. Because parenting is a critical area of interest among family literacy program participants, curricula for enhancing reading, writing, oral communication, critical thinking and math skills are shaped by learners and often include such topics as discipline, safety, drug awareness, child growth and development, family learning, understanding school systems and how to advocate for the education of children.

(4) Through the use of a variety of traditional and innovative nontraditional instructional approaches, effective community based family and intergenerational literacy programs address the diversity of learners' knowledge and competencies.

Among programs surveyed, the entry educational level of adult learners ranged from 0 to 12th grade, with a small percentage having completed one to two years of post-secondary education. However, as stated earlier, most had formal educations between the 4th and 9th grades--although they may not have had actual skills proficiencies comparable to these grade levels. To accommodate differences in skills levels, students are taught in large and small groups, receive individualized tutoring, attend workshops, and participate in field trips to supplement in-class instruction. Learners with more advanced skills participate as peer tutors to support students who require assistance in mastering skills concepts.

Although few programs provide on-site support services for individuals with special needs (e.g., learning disabilities), CBOs try to locate and refer students to community resources which can appropriately address their needs (e.g., learning specialists or programs for non-readers). At Dorcas Place Parent Literacy Center (RI), where each educational program has been designed to accommodate persons at specific proficiency levels, there is a component for "alternative learners"--who are instructed by staff trained to teach learning disabled students.

Learning groups at these programs are arranged by homogenous skill levels or, depending on the learners' instructional needs, may be comprised of students with varied skills proficiencies. More traditional instructional approaches are initially used by community based programs to assist persons having little or no reading skills. For example, in instructing non-readers or ESL students, programs often teach phonics and employ rote learning strategies (e.g., oral and written drills). CBOs also find that traditional approaches, such as lecturing, are often "more desired and accepted" by learners who are preparing to take the GED examination. Such is the case at Tacoma Community House (WA), which provides multi-level literacy and basic education programs for a diverse population of native born persons, minorities, refugees and immigrants, and has gradually begun to incorporate the use of more non-traditional instructional techniques within its pre-GED and GED level classes.

Within CBOs, modeling, role playing, writing and class discussions are frequently used to stimulate learning and provide opportunities for students to practice and reinforce new skills. Parents, in learning how to read to and teach their children, are allowed to "observe" program staff engage in these and other learning activities with children. Through observation and discussion of techniques, parents are "guided" in understanding how to assume their roles as their children's "first teachers."

Additionally, because many parents feel threatened by officials of the public school system, community based programs often use role playing to simulate such activities as parent-teacher conferences and other meetings designed to address issues related to children's school attendance, performance, behavior and special needs, and to increase parents' self-confidence and effectiveness in advocating for their children. Role playing is also used to address issues pertaining to child abuse and neglect, discipline, family communication, etc.

In the community based classroom, the "whole language" learning approach is commonly used. This technique, which views reading, writing and discussion as complementary activities, uses topics of interest to learners as the focus of writing and reading exercises and class dialogues. Regardless of their skill level, learners are encouraged to express their creativity, ideas, concerns and feelings through writing (e.g., in individual and dialogue journals, family histories, stories and poems). At the Denver Indian Center family histories which reflect cultural traditions and heritage are developed by and shared with all learners in the Center's family literacy program. Student writing strengthens the program in several ways. It is used to promote skills enhancement, identify and solve problems, assess achievement in a variety of areas, and create educational materials.

(5) In addition to employing a variety of instructional strategies and approaches, CBOs use both commercial and non-commercial educational materials (teacher- and student-generated), traditional and nontraditional assessment methods.

The Refugee Women's Alliance (WA) provides a prime example of how programs encourage students to develop and use their own materials. Each year, learners participate in a "Story Telling Project" which generates a collection of personal stories from refugee and immigrant women that are shared with other students through reading and dramatization. Through this activity, which encourages each learner to contribute a story from her native country, participants are reminded of their "value" as members of the "classroom community" and are celebrated as representatives of their diverse cultures.

Participants of REWA's "Story Telling Project" (with the support of bilingual aides) use both English and their native languages to present their stories. The cross-cultural exchange fosters a community atmosphere within the classroom and allows learners to identify similarities, as well as differences, in their cultures, aspirations, special interests and concerns.

With regard to assessment, although six of the programs use the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) for pre- and post-evaluation, most supplement standardized testing with assessment methods that indicate growth in non-academic areas. Recognizing that adults' and children's personal and social development cannot be assessed by traditional methods, CBOs incorporate a number of strategies to monitor growth/progress in a variety of areas (e.g., parenting, self-esteem building, educational planning, self/family advocating, action planning, job seeking, etc.). Programs record anecdotal data which reflect learners' progress in solving personal dilemmas; changes in attitudes, behaviors and practices (both in and outside class); increased self-esteem, development in establishing goals and action plans, etc. These notations, in addition to teacher/tutor observations and learner self-assessments, become essential parts of student portfolios or files--which may include tests, worksheets, writing samples, journal entries and special projects which are reviewed to evaluate achievement.

(6) Regardless of the population served in community based intergenerational and family literacy programs, concentrated parent-child interaction is encouraged as part of the skills building program.

Programs teach parents how to use everyday situations (e.g., cooking) to stimulate their children to learn, and how to recognize their children's reading and learning readiness. Parents receive tips on and resources for assisting their children with homework--some even having access to programs' resource libraries (which include multicultural books, video and audio cassette tapes) and are encouraged to schedule regular story reading times with children, attend library story hours, art exhibits and cultural activities which broaden their world view and knowledge.

For many parents in community based literacy programs, their participation provides their first exposure to libraries, cultural and other enrichment activities. Among all programs researched, enrichment and social activities were cited by learners and staff as essential to the educational process and building a sense of "community" and support within the classroom.

Additionally, programs provide families with free books, magazines, and other literacy artifacts for home use through donations from community businesses, social organizations and programs. For example, Bronx Educational Services and the Parent-Child Development Center provide books to learners through their affiliation with Reading is Fundamental (RIF), Inc.

(7) Programs have supporting linkages and partnerships with other community based literacy, social and health services providers, advocates, coalitions and educational institutions to increase their capacity to serve disadvantaged individuals and families.

Programs "partner" with local Mental Health Departments and other social service agencies, colleges and universities for the provision of specialized counseling, emergency assistance and support services. For example, Dorcas Place Parent Literacy Center's relationship with Rhode Island College's School of Social Work Department provides the CBO with on-site social work interns who are supervised by the Center's resident MSW and assist learners in addressing critical problems and needs.

Programs also form consortiums which result in shared responsibility for providing education, training and resources to learners. For example, The Neighborhood Institute, located on Chicago's south side, collaborates with City College, IBM and the local Boys and Girls Clubs. They belong to coalitions which provide resources, training and networking opportunities for program staff, as well as structures for program administrators, staff (and sometimes learners) to promote literacy as an essential life tool. They also strategize approaches for affecting local and state policies regarding adult literacy and education program practices and standards. For example, Workforce Instructional Network, which conducts Head Start programs in San Marcos and other counties of Texas, is closely affiliated with San Marcos Literacy Action--the primary literacy networking group in the county whose members include service providers, former and current learners and other community supporters.

Community based family and intergenerational literacy programs often invite community advocates to discuss community action needs with learners--such as quality education for children and improved sanitation conditions--and encourage and support learners in improving social conditions in their communities.

IMPROVING EXISTING PROGRAM STRATEGIES

Despite the exemplary practices documented in the site visits, all programs cited areas where they could improve. Because most or all of the community based programs engage in ongoing evaluation and planning, they were not hesitant to discuss the issue of "development and improvement."

Recommendations (suggested by ACBE project staff and/or program staff and administrators) for program enhancement were made in three major areas: education and service provision, staffing, and overall administration. These recommendations are not necessarily pertinent to every program evaluated.

(1) Education and Service Delivery

(a) Enhance participatory learning, evaluation and planning strategies by regularly involving learners in decision-making processes, for example as student council members, representatives to or members of boards, in recruitment efforts and special projects (e.g., program newsletter production);

(b) Develop learner needs and skills assessment and goal-setting as ongoing processes (i.e., not only at program entrance and exit, but periodically throughout the training);

(c) Integrate more "concentrated" child/youth education and development components, including skills development assessment procedures which will enable programs to effectively evaluate and document their impact on children); and

(d) Provide quality, affordable child care services that are either on-site or more geographically accessible to the families.

(2) Staffing

Five of the programs are extremely understaffed (i.e., they do not have adequate staff to ensure an appropriate student/staff ratio), and those with more resources tend to rely on part-time workers and volunteers. Major tasks, such as teaching, coordinating, proposal writing, and caring for children, are often the responsibilities of five (or fewer) persons, with overlapping job responsibilities.

In order to provide services more effectively, programs require adequate staffing, and adequate staff planning and administration time to coordinate intra- and interagency services, develop proposals and curricula, learning materials and activities, review and document student progress and keep abreast of developments in the field.

(3) Overall Program Development and Administration

Several areas require continued, ongoing development. They include: program funding, partnerships and linkages with others in the field, creative involvement of learners, and program documentation.

(a) Funding

Community based literacy programs are chronically underfunded and typically unable to provide adequate space, child care services, appropriate educational resources and staff. Funding must not only become available, but must be consistent to ensure that established programs can maintain their quality and availability to their communities.

(b) Partnerships and Linkages

Programs must continue to develop new partnerships and linkages with other community support service providers, coalitions and advocates. The field study identified a variety of partnerships developed to increase the capacity of programs to serve their communities. Although most programs engage in collaborative relationships, some partnerships are not as effective as others. Collaborations which seem to work best have been developed by programs, other agencies and institutions which share service delivery philosophies, have a mutual understanding of the service population, devise processes and structures for systematic service coordination, follow-up and documentation, and engage in joint service evaluation and planning.

Interagency coordination, another essential means of program support, is also suggested as a strategy for improving program effectiveness. Interagency coordination allows educational programs to utilize the expertise and resources of social/human and other community services agencies in helping learners meet their needs. Formal linkages among participating programs, agencies and institutions could include interagency networking and cross-training (to ensure that all service providers are knowledgeable of the needs of the service population), the development of referral systems and advisory councils, joint service and peer evaluations.

(c) Learners as Program Recruiters

Programs may need to re-examine their recruitment procedures to identify ways to increase learner involvement. All sites reported that, although they use a variety of outreach and recruitment strategies (e.g., public service announcements, flyers, outreach campaigns and referrals from other programs), most students learn about the community based programs through current and former participants. Creating opportunities for learners with "first-hand" knowledge of the programs to participate in formal recruitment promotes their sense of "ownership." It also

increases their visibility as role models within the community, and gives prospective students opportunities to share ideas, goals and concerns with community residents who have, unlike some program staff and administrators, had similar life experiences.

(d) Documentation

The ability of programs to assess and report evidence of learner needs, achievement and progress, prepare reports to funders and other supporters, evaluate program effectiveness and develop strategies and approaches, is shaped, to a large degree, by their capacity to collect, evaluate and report program data in an accurate and useful manner. Strategies for increasing effectiveness in program documentation techniques include:

- Developing better defined and manageable documentation systems;
- Designing and implementing systems for monitoring the progress of former students (e.g., through the use of periodic surveys, student alumni associations and mentoring programs); and
- Learning how to document anecdotal information related to student achievement in a manner that will allow others to understand the important ways in which learners are positively affected by their participation. This includes "non-quantifiable" indicators of growth (such as improved self-esteem) which are connected to the broad-based goals of learners obtaining their GEDs, becoming better parents, securing employment and achieving economic self-sufficiency.

PROGRAM FUNDING

Like many community based organizations, most of the programs in this study have operating budgets that are developed with contributions from diverse funding sources.

- Nine of the programs receive funding from foundations, such as the Barbara Bush Foundation, New York Life, W.K. Kellogg, and the Coors Family Literacy Foundation.

- Nine of the programs are supported by individual and corporate donations.

- Eight of the programs receive federal and/or state funding through Health and Human Services, the Department of Education, and/or Adult Basic Education, with three being Even Start programs and two being funded by Head Start.

- The United Way supports three of the programs.

- Two receive some assistance (in actual dollars or in-kind contributions) through formal collaborations with other institutions and organizations.

To supplement their annual budgets, most of the programs conduct fund-raising campaigns or seek support from special assistance programs (e.g., both the Refugee Women's Alliance and Tacoma Community House's Refugee Women's Project are supported by DORA, the Division of Refugee Assistance).

In developing funding plans, programs conduct annual needs assessments, some more formal than others. They seek input from primary staff and learners, as well as administrators, in preparation for researching and targeting funders whose philanthropic interests are compatible with community based objectives and philosophies. Currently, several of the programs are re-evaluating their funding strategies (e.g., some have become more interested in obtaining state funding--which is more likely to provide multi-year support, while others are seeking private foundation support for the first time).

PROGRAM PROBLEMS AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

The leading obstacle faced by community based family and intergenerational literacy program providers is the instability of funding. Funding instability contributes to the loss of staff, essential program components and support services needed to promote learners' full participation and successful completion. Ten of the 23 programs initially surveyed had, at some time during their operation, experienced a loss in funding. Although only four of the 14 programs researched felt less certain about continued funding, when originally surveyed, most of the programs considered for participation in the research project described the overall status of their funding as being only "fairly stable", a common problem faced by community based organizations nationwide.

Other major programmatic problems common to all or most of the sites include:

(1) Lack of affordable, reliable transportation for learners to travel to and from programs;

(2) Inaccessibility of affordable, quality child care services; and

(3) Lack of available (and diversified) local/community job opportunities which provide adequate wages and benefits to permit adults to support themselves and their families.

Historically, community based programs have relied on their vision of program quality, their creativity and flexibility to address these problems. One effective strategy to increase funding is to leverage resources through collaborations with other federal and state family support-oriented programs, such as Even Start, Head Start and JOBS (Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program), other consortiums and cooperatives which provide multi-year funding and/or create structures for organizations to share service delivery responsibilities.

Programs which have specific areas of expertise (e.g., in developing volunteer tutor programs or integrating child education and development components) may want to consider implementing a fee-for-service plan which can generate additional funding.

The transportation dilemma, which is a barrier to program participation in both low-income urban and rural areas, is particularly problematic in rural locations. Suggested strategies include developing and locating programs within public housing units or other areas more easily accessible to learners (e.g., in Kentucky, Whitley County Communities for Children operates a "School-on-Wheels" program), and requesting funds to cover the cost of transportation tokens or stipends for learners.

The optimal situation for most disadvantaged parents who are pursuing their education or training is having on-site child care which provides quality, affordable service in a safe environment. If the lack of space or funding will not allow programs to provide these services directly, establishing relationships with respected local child care providers who

will agree to set aside "slots" for disadvantaged families will help ensure that parents have access to services which are appropriate to all their child care needs. Additionally, for programs which offer a variety of class schedules to learners, "baby-sitting cooperatives"--managed by parents--could be developed as a viable alternative to licensed child care, and would further encourage adult learners to support each other, as well as create opportunities for them to reinforce new and existing parenting skills.

Because community based family and intergenerational literacy programs forge a connection between basic education skills proficiency and the ability of individuals and families to live and work productively within their communities, the lack of jobs and diversified employment options in some locales (which may hinder disadvantaged persons from entering and completing education and training programs) may be addressed in several ways. Programs may seek to provide training in small business development and management, and to support learners who are interested in creating and operating their own businesses. They may develop linkages with local businesses to target their programs on skills required in the local job market, and to solicit commitments from employers to hire their graduates. They may also encourage learners to collectively create new community oriented businesses/services which meet a particular community need (e.g., home renovation for the elderly, child care, other parenting and family support programs).

These strategies, however, do not address the major barriers to achieving economic self-sufficiency: the lack of effective social support services in many disadvantaged communities, the inadequacy of education and training programs, the lack of affordable, quality health care, and the scarcity of jobs and decent housing.

ACTION STEPS FOR DEVELOPING EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY BASED FAMILY AND INTERGENERATIONAL LITERACY PROGRAMS

(1) Eliminate barriers to participation through pre-educational counseling and the provision of support services.

(2) Create a non-threatening learning environment.

(3) Relate instruction to the students' needs and interests.

(4) Create participatory learning structures.

(5) Conduct ongoing learner needs assessment and educational planning.

(6) Involve learners in conducting program activities (e.g., peer counseling and teaching, recruitment, child care, etc.).

(7) Use a variety of instructional materials and approaches, including traditional and non-traditional techniques.

(8) Enhance traditional assessment methods and instruments with innovative, non-traditional skills evaluation techniques.

(9) Develop strong supportive linkages and partnerships with other service providers and institutions to increase program capacity.

(10) Seek consistent, reliable program funding.

(11) Conduct ongoing, participatory program evaluation and improvement.

(12) Develop processes and structures which allow the assessment, documentation and reporting of long- and short-range impacts on all learners.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Community based literacy providers are making positive contributions to the field of family literacy. They are implementing "holistic" strategies, practices and methodologies which contextualize literacy to the specific structure, needs and interests of educationally and economically disadvantaged families; build on learners' existing knowledge and skills, provide supplemental support services (often through partnerships with other community service agencies) to alleviate barriers to participation; foster "learner investment" through active and participatory learning, individualized educational planning, program and self-assessment; and employ diverse (traditional and nontraditional) techniques in improving and evaluating literacy and basic education, parenting and other life skills.

For these programs, family and intergenerational literacy is not an isolated concept, but is connected to the ability of individuals and families to support themselves and the communities in which they live, through continued education, self-sufficiency, advocacy and social change.

In addition to improvements in literacy and basic education, critical thinking and problem solving skills (among adults and/or children), major benefits of program participation include the enhancement of family relationships, parenting and child teaching skills, and increased community involvement.

In order for community based programs to continue to provide quality literacy programs, they must be supported by stable, consistent funding which allows them to further enhance existing strategies, practices and methodologies through research, evaluation and staff development; create and improve partnerships and linkages with other community support service providers, educational institutions, coalitions and advocates; and systematize documentation and reporting techniques to allow accurate monitoring of learner achievements, analysis of effective and ineffective strategies, and the delineation of program results to current and potential funders.

In addition, programs must more closely examine, assess and document their impact on children--perhaps incorporating more concentrated child/youth education and development components and evaluation procedures, working collaboratively with schools to assess the impact of program participation on children's mainstream education, and/or working with parents to encourage them to regularly implement family learning activities and analyze the effects on their children.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCH, POLICY AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

A. Research

Because the development of family and intergenerational literacy as distinct concepts and practices is relatively recent, it is important to generate good and reliable data about their effectiveness, usefulness and long-term impact. Some of the questions that are worth pursuing are:

(1) Are programs which provide direct service or intervention to both parents and children more effective than those which only directly serve either?

(2) What effects do programs have on children's formal education?

(3) What are the long-term effects of programs on adults and children?

(4) How do family structures change (psychologically, socially, academically and economically) because of program participation?

(5) How do these programs affect the communities in which they function?

The implications for additional research include, among others, the need for longitudinal studies which monitor the results of families' subsequent education/training, employment histories, and involvement in community life. Some local studies are already under way. For example, Penn Community Services in South Carolina has recently begun a five-year study to assess the effects of its youth-oriented Program For Academic and Cultural Enrichment on the formal education of participants. The study will compare school success of participants and non-participants by reviewing students' public school records, including attendance rates, standardized test performance, promotion and failure rates, school suspensions and drop outs.

Other research may examine the effects of culturally-based versus non-culturally-based programs, participatory and learner-centered versus non-participatory and learner-centered instructional approaches, and how to effectively evaluate, plan and improve programs.

B. Policy: Welfare Reform, Integrated Employment Skills Training and Program Quality Indicators

(1) Welfare Reform

Over 90% of learners participating in the 14 family literacy programs in this study receive some form of public assistance. Most receive AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children). The recent debate on Welfare Reform--which promises to

significantly alter the existing system and may limit welfare recipients to two years of financial support--presents a rare opportunity for community based programs to take an active role in shaping the outcomes of a major initiative.

The need for reform is great. But it must be reform that is significant and leads to long-term solutions and self-sufficiency. Promising reform must include access to comprehensive, quality education and training programs, career counseling, supportive services and opportunities for meaningful work and well-paying jobs. Community based programs can make significant contributions in this area, but without a strong federal commitment to restructure and redirect solutions to poverty, it will remain, at best, a difficult and unresolved effort.

(2) Integrated Employment Skills Training

Perhaps the most important element of a successful welfare reform effort, next to the availability of meaningful and well-paying jobs, is the opportunity for effective integrated educational and employment skills training programs. Such programs are scarce, but the potential for meeting this need is substantial, by adapting some of the better literacy and skills training programs and extending the "contextual" instructional approach to include learners' job-related goals and needs. Although two years may be too short a time for many of the potential participants to fully benefit from such programs, a genuine transformation of the system will contribute a lot toward this objective.

The Workforce Instructional Network (WIN) in San Marcos, TX provides a good example of such an approach. The primary focus of its basic skills education is the attainment of "good jobs" which will lead to families' self-sufficiency. Thus, instruction is job-related, emphasizing employment-based literacy and numeracy while providing the participants with specific and useful information about employment opportunities. This approach accelerates the development process, allowing learners to achieve their overall goal of "getting a job" sooner.

(3) Program Quality Indicators

With the exception of a few states, federally-mandated and state-developed indicators of program quality for literacy place little emphasis on family literacy. For example, Texas makes reference to providing community resources which support "the total family," and Wisconsin refers to the attainment of basic skills in empowering learners in their roles as parents. Several other states, including Indiana, West Virginia, Rhode Island and Illinois, also expanded program recruitment targets to include--as priorities--persons whose lack of basic education and life skills impede their ability to positively effect the literacy and education of their children.

Despite the lack of significant concentration on family literacy, however, states did develop a number of quality indicators and program standards that are applicable

to intergenerational programs. As in ACBE's Framework for Assessing Program Quality, several states cited as evidence of student growth and achievement "personal and social development." Some states also suggested that student progress could be determined through observations of "changes in attitudes and behaviors," "enhanced personal satisfaction and self-esteem," and "the demonstration of development in literacy skills and competencies that assist learners in meeting their educational needs"--whatever those needs might be (e.g., technical skills training preparation, GED attainment, parenting, employment, etc.).

Many of the state quality indicators developed are also particularly pertinent to conducting quality family and intergenerational literacy programs. State indicators which are adaptable to intergenerational programs include:

(a) Using holistic, learner-centered instructional approaches;

(b) Providing support services;

(c) Having flexible scheduling, enrollment and participation periods;

(d) Designing curricula and instructional techniques which respond to students' varied needs, interests, learning styles, cultural and ethnic backgrounds;

(e) Promoting ongoing, participatory program planning and evaluation;

(f) Fostering adults' participation in society (which strengthens individual learners and communities at-large);

(g) Enhancing learners' existing strengths;

(h) Promoting individualized learner goal-setting and educational planning;

(i) Promoting learners' active participation;

(j) Developing learners' critical thinking and problem solving skills;

(k) Incorporating "meaningful" class discussions and activities into learning plans;

(l) Integrating language development and culture (for ESL populations); and

(m) Using a variety of assessment instruments and methodologies.

As demonstrated by this project, these and other practices are gradually being incorporated into exemplary community based family and intergenerational literacy programs. These approaches have been effective, as evidenced by reports of learners' increased self-awareness and self-esteem, enhanced basic skills, employment gains, community involvement, etc. Less understood, however, are the specific results of intergenerational programs on children, and the extent to which parenting skills are enhanced.

In order to more effectively assess these issues, programs must focus their attention on developing quality indicators and standards that will ensure that all family members benefit--directly or indirectly--by program participation, and that programs can accurately recognize, assess and document indicators of growth and development among all participants.

For example, adapting the Framework for assessing family literacy programs, including indicators and measures which allow programs to identify and assess aspects of child development (e.g., language and social skills development, school readiness, etc.) within their home environments and other settings, would be essential to understanding the full impact of programs designed to "support the total family" and increasing their effectiveness in meeting this broad-based goal.

Because the concept of "parenting" is such an integral part of family learning and development, programs would also need to incorporate structures and processes which enable them to more thoroughly evaluate and improve adults' growth in terms of specific parenting skills (e.g., communicating, teaching, thinking critically and solving problems, disciplining, and providing safe, comfortable, positively stimulating home environments which foster children's feelings of security, education and development).

Family and intergenerational literacy programs can provide numerous opportunities for increasing the capacity of families to function productively within society. The impact of these programs, however, depends to a significant degree on the ability of providers to understand their communities' needs, how to effectively meet these needs and to recognize when they have been met. If programs are to be truly effective, they must begin to think more "globally" about family literacy and how it can foster the creation of self-sufficient communities, as well as individuals. Only through the institutionalization of more well-defined assessment practices, quality indicators and standards will programs be able to increase their capacity and understand the full impact of their work.

C. Staff Development

As suggested in the recommendations for improving existing program strategies, "staff development" is an essential component in maintaining quality community based intergenerational and family literacy programs. During ACBE's field research and evaluation, it was discovered that less than half (43%) of the programs have devised

formal staff development plans. Among programs, staff training (with the exception of what is provided for volunteer tutors) may or may not be required. Unfortunately, funding for these programs rarely includes staff development. Because of convenience and restricted--or non-existent--staff development budgets, most of the CBOs (79%) take advantage of training opportunities offered through local and state literacy and adult education coalitions. Although these activities contribute to meeting staff training needs, they do not always allow programs timely and ongoing access to current, and most significant, developments in the field.

Increasingly, state-wide and national literacy conferences are sponsoring workshops which specifically address family literacy. The National Center for Family Literacy (Kentucky) offers an annual conference for practitioners, researchers, administrators and others in the field. However, while many groups could benefit, travel and related costs often make participation prohibitive. The limited resources available for staff development in community based family and intergenerational literacy programs call for creativity and persistence. A difficult but effective approach would be to integrate staff development into the core operational and programmatic budget of the organization. For example, at the Germantown Women's Educational Project, some of the unrestricted funds raised from community foundations for core operating support, are used to cover the cost of staff development.

Other CBO Adult Basic Education programs with more well defined staff development plans (e.g., Dorcas Place) are beginning to take advantage of federal AEA funds, and 353 money available for research and development, which provides set-asides for staff development. This funding has allowed programs to implement more state-of-the-art, research-based staff development programs which balance the enhancement of "hands-on," technical skills with the broadening of local focus to state and national arenas.

Recently, the National Institute for Literacy issued a Request for Proposals to encourage states to conduct interagency development programs as part of their efforts to build organizational capacity. These programs will be implemented by the State Literacy Resource Centers (SLRCs). The SLRCs will specifically target their services to programs funded by JOBS, AEA, AFDC and JTPA (Job Training Partnership Act). Hopefully, programs will be able to receive timely, integrated and continuous staff development from the SLRCs.

These are only a few examples of the staff development initiatives that may be available to local programs. Equally important, however, is to keep abreast of research findings and to maintain contacts with other local and national providers, recognized consultants and researchers.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: ACBE FAMILY LITERACY PROJECT TASK FORCE

Lauren Allen
The Woodlawn Organization
6040 South Harper Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60649
(312) 288-5840

Ann Baier
Rural Development Center
P.O. Box 5415
Salinas, California 93915
(408) 758-1469

Carol Feeney
Neighborhood Education Project
P.O. Box 60596
Nashville, Tennessee 37206
(615) 262-1111

Carolyn Ferrell
Bronx Educational Services
965 Longwood Avenue, Room 309
Bronx, New York 10459
(718) 991-7310

Nancye Gaj
Motheread
4208 Six Forks Road
Building 2, Suite 335
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609
(919) 781-2088

Maite Jordan
St. Augustine College
1333 West Argyle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60640
(312) 878-8756

Loren McGrail
World Education
210 Lincoln Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
(617) 482-9485

Christine McKay
The Family Place
3309 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20010
(202) 265-0149

Patricia Medina
Bronx Educational Services
965 Longwood Avenue, Room 309
Bronx, New York 10459
(718) 991-7310

Robert Moore
Urban Appalachian Council
2115 West 8th Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45204
(519) 251-0202

Sharon Morgenthaler
1753 Willard Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009
(202) 667-3338

Barbara Todd
619 East 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637
(312) 947-8148

APPENDIX B: PROGRAM SURVEY

ASSOCIATION FOR COMMUNITY BASED EDUCATION

Project Title: "Effective Practices in Community Based Literacy"

FAMILY/INTERGENERATIONAL LITERACY PROGRAM SURVEY

A. GENERAL IDENTIFYING INFORMATION:

1. Organization Name: _____

2. Address: _____

_____

3. Telephone: (___) ___ - ____

4. Fax Number: (___) ___ - ____

5. Executive Director: _____

6. Daily Office Hours: _____

B. GEOGRAPHIC AND ETHNOGRAPHIC INFORMATION (for family/intergenerational program):

1. Locale (urban/suburban/rural): _____

2. Racial/Ethnic Service Population/s and Percentages: _____

_____

_____

3. Current Number of Participants: _____ (adults)

_____ (children)

4. Gender/s of Adult Participants: male (yes ___ no ___)

female (yes ___ no ___)

% of Male Adults: _____ % of Female Adults: _____

Age Range of Adult Participants: _____

5. Genders of Youth Participants: male (yes ___ no ___)

female (yes ___ no ___)

% of Male Youth: _____ % of Female Youth: _____

Age Range of Youth Participants: _____

% of Pre-School Youth: _____

% of Elementary School Youth: _____

6. Relationships Between Adults and Youth (Check response.):

   related _____ non-related _____ related and non-related _____

7. Other Special Populations (e.g., LEP students, learning disabled, etc.) and Percentages:

   population: _____ %: _____

   population: _____ %: _____

8. Percentage of Single Heads of Household: _____

9. Percentage of Public Assistance Recipients: _____

10. Educational Backgrounds of Adult Participants (in grades completed):

    Check all that apply.

    0-3 ___ Percentage: _____ 7-9 ___ Percentage: _____

    4-6 ___ Percentage: _____ 10-12 ___ Percentage: _____

    13 + (post secondary) ___ Percentage: _____

C. **FAMILY/INTERGENERATIONAL LITERACY PROGRAM SPECIFICATIONS:**

1. Name of Program Component: _____

2. Director/Coordinator of Program: _____

3. Age of Program: _____

4. Literacy Program Type: family ___ intergenerational ___
   family and intergenerational ___

5. Program Model Type: parent focused (separate) ___
   child focused (separate) ___
   parent-child focused (together) ___
   parent/child combination ___
   non-related adult-child focused ___

6. How does the program define "family/intergenerational" literacy, and why is it defined this way?

   Response: _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

7. Length of Program Cycle (# of weeks): _____

   (Explanatory Note/s: _____

   _____)

8. Explain the organizational structure of the program (including specifications of basic skills education provided, service provider collaborations, support services, services for other special populations, and the program's relationship to other organizational service components, e.g., the relationship between the literacy program and the organization's employment and job skills training component).

   Basic Skills Areas: _____

   _____

   Basic Skills Education Service Provider Collaborations: _____

   _____

   _____

   Program Support Services: _____

   _____

   Support Service Providers: _____

   _____

   _____

   Services for Other Special Populations: _____

   _____

   _____

Employment and Job Skills Training: _____

_____

_____

Literacy Program's Relationship to Other Service Components:

_____

_____

_____

Additional Information (as necessary): _____

_____

_____

9. Does the program have linkages to other commuity literacy providers/efforts? yes ___ no ___

   If so, with whom (e.g., RIF, PLUS, Literacy Coalitions, etc.)?

   Response: _____

   _____

   _____

10. How is the program staffed (specify staff number, positions, auxiliary service providers--e.g., volunteers)?

    Response: _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

11. Is the program conducted on-site? yes ___ no ___

    If not, where do program activities occur?

    Response: _____

    _____

12. How many hours (weekly) are provided for teaching/working with adults?

    Response: _____

13. How many hours (weekly) are provided for teaching/working with children/youth?

    Response: _____

14. What are the program's overall goals/objectives (i.e., what is the program attempting to accomplish)?

    Goals/Objectives: _____

    _____

    _____

    Identify 3-4 regularly used learning activities that are reflective of the program's teaching philosophy, methodologies and practices.

    Response: _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    Are the educational materials used commercial/non-commercial?

    commercial ___ non-commercial ___ both ___

15. What qualities/features make the program unique/special/effective/exemplary?

    Response: _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

16. Describe what you do to assess adult/youth learners' skills during their participation in the program.

Adults: _____

_____

_____

Children/Youth: _____

_____

_____

17. How (if applicable) does the program assess the impact working with parents has on their children?

Response: _____

_____

18. How does the program encourage parents to become advocates for their children's education (and related rights)? *Give 1-2 specific examples.

Response: _____

_____

_____

19. How does the program continue to assist participants after they have completed the program?

Response: _____

_____

_____

D. PROGRAM STABILITY, ADMINISTRATION, AND DEVELOPMENT:
*NOTE: Look for linkages with Head Start, Even Start, JOBS, etc.

1. How is the program funded? (Identify funding sources.)

Response: _____

_____

% of Public Funding: _____ % of Private Funding: _____

How stable has the program funding been? Response: _____

_____

Do you expect to be refunded (either by current or other funder/s)? yes ___ no ___

2. Describe your Board structure.

Response: _____

_____

_____

How does the Board reflect the characteristics of the program's service population/s?

Response: _____

_____

Have there been or are there currently any program participants on the Board? yes ___ no ___

E. <u>ACBE PROJECT PARTICIPATION INTEREST, FEASIBILITY AND CAPACITY</u>:

1. Is the organization interested in participating in ACBE's evaluation and demonstration project (including the case study)? yes ___ no ___

For what reason/s is the organization interested/not interested in participating in the project?

Response: _____

_____

2. How does your program currently document program activities?

Response: _____

_____

_____

Would the program be able to share these documents with ACBE staff? yes ___ no ___

3. Would program staff be willing and able to work with ACBE to coordinate a 2-2 1/2 day site visit (including arranging meetings with other program staff, administrators and learners, coordinating class session observations, compiling documentation, etc.)? yes ___ no ___

   What on-site person/s would be available to assist ACBE with planning a site visit?

   Response: _____

4. When is the best time (during April-July) to visit the program when relevant program staff, learners, etc. will be available for project participation?

   Specific Time Period: _____

   Specific Day/s of the Week: _____

5. *FOR PROGRAMS SERVING ESL POPULATIONS:

   Would someone be available to translate while ACBE staff observe classes, talk to participants, etc.?

   yes ___ no ___

6. What would a non-program participant/"outsider" need to know to effectively gather information from program staff and participants?

   Response: _____

   _____

   Do staff and/or participants have any particular concerns about talking to "outsiders," and if so, what are these concerns?

   Response: _____

   _____

7. Are there additional comments/concerns regarding the organization's participation in this project? yes ___ no ___

If so, please specify.

Response: _____

_____

_____

Interview Date/s: _____

Interviewee/s: _____

_____

_____

Interviewer: Literacy Project Coordinator

03/23/93

APPENDIX C: FIELD RESEARCH PROTOCOL

ACBE FAMILY/INTERGENERATIONAL LITERACY PROJECT

SITE VISIT PROTOCOL
(DAY ONE)

_____ (.5 hr.) Introductory Meeting with Executive Director and/or Program Coordinator

_____ (1.5 hrs.) Interview with Program Coordinator

_____ (1.0 hr.) Class Observation

_____ (1.0 hr.) Lunch: Interview with Youth Learners (as applicable)/Other Program Staff,etc.

_____ (1.5 hrs.) Interview with Adult Learners

_____ (1.0 hr.) Meeting with Partnership Agency/Organization Staff and Observations (as applicable)

_____ (1.0 hr.) Review of Written Materials (Program Documentation)

SITE VISIT PROTOCOL
(DAY TWO)

_____ (.5 hr.) Interview with Executive Director or Board Member/s (as needed/applicable)

_____ (1.0 hr.) Class Observation/Meeting with Partnership Agency/Organization and Observations (as applicable)

_____ (1.5 hrs.) Interview with Staff

_____ (1.0 hr.) Lunch: Interview with Youth Learners (as applicable)/Other Program Staff, etc. (as needed)

_____ (1.5 hrs.) Interview with Program Coordinator, Staff and Adult Learners

_____ (1.0 hr.) Review of Written Materials (Program Documentation)

_____ (1.0 hr.) Exit Interview with Executive Director and/or Program Coordinator

_____ (.5 hr.) Open (use as necessary)

APPENDIX D: FIELD RESEARCH INTERVIEW PROCESS

ACBE SITE VISIT INTERVIEW PROCESS

I. Project Introduction

II. Brief Participant Introductions

III. Overview of Site Visit Activity and Methodology

IV. General Guidelines for Responding During Interview

V. Addressing the "Confidentiality" Issue

VI. The Interview

VII. Additional Participant Comments (as needed)

VIII. ACBE Staff Remarks of Appreciation/Closure

APPENDIX E: FIELD RESEARCH INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

PART ONE: Processes and Structures for Program Planning, Evaluation and Continuous Improvement

INTERVIEW FOR PROGRAM COORDINATOR

1. Why was the family/intergenerational literacy program established (for what purpose/s was/were the program started)?

2. What were the original goals of the program, and how (if applicable) have they changed since it began? (What service/s has/have been added/deleted/altered because of changes in program goals?)

2a. Optional (as needed):

What prompted the changes in program goals?

3. What steps are used in defining program goals and developing yearly operational plans?

3a. Optional (as needed):

Who is involved in the process of defining program goals and developing yearly operational plans?

4. How does the program record evidence of program activities and learner progress? (What types of written/audio/visual materials are maintained that illustrate what happens in the program and how learners progress?)

4a. Who records this information?

4b. How often is program and learner progress information recorded/collected, and why?

5. How is program and learner progress information used after it is recorded? (What happens to program and learner progress information that is recorded?)

6. Optional (as needed):

How are learner needs, the program and its progress in meeting goals evaluated? (What information and steps are used in assessing learner needs, evaluating and improving program performance?)

6a. Optional (as needed):

Who is involved in learner needs assessment and program evaluation activities, and how often do these activities occur?)

PART TWO: Demonstrated Improvements in Learner Achievements, Program Quality and Community Development

INTERVIEW FOR PROGRAM COORDINATOR

FOCUS: Program Quality

1. Since the program was developed, what improvements in service quality have occurred, and by what methods? (How has program quality improved since the program was developed?)

2. Optional (as needed):

   Is the program in partnership with other community service providers, and if so, with whom and for what purpose/s?

2a. How did this partnership evolve?

3. How (if applicable) does the program assist participants in understanding and appreciating cultural diversity?

3a. What results has the program witnessed in these efforts? (What have been the results of the program's efforts in this regard?)

4. How (if applicable) does the program support learners' continued development after they leave the program? (What services and program linkages are offered to or provided for program participants which assist them in getting additional education/training, gaining employment, etc?)

4a. What evidence does the program have of how it supports learners' continued development?

PART THREE: Processes and Structures for Program and Learner Development

INTERVIEW FOR PROGRAM COORDINATOR

FOCUS: Staff Recruitment, Development and Retention

1. How are program staffing decisions made? (What steps does the program regularly follow in staffing the program? What factors are considered when selecting program staff? Who is involved in the process of recruiting, interviewing and hiring program staff?)

2. How does the program balance staff teaching responsibilities? (What is considered when assigning learners to specific instructors/determining teaching loads?)

3. Describe the program's staff development plan. (In what development activities do staff participate? Who/what staff positions participate in development activities, and how often? Who identifies and recommends staff development activities? What resources are available for staff development activities--and through what means?)

PART THREE: Processes and Structures for Program and Learner Development

INTERVIEW FOR PROGRAM COORDINATOR

FOCUS: Learner Recruitment, Development and Retention

"Building Participation"

1. What does the program regularly do to inform the community about its services and activities?

1a. How does the program relate this information to groups/individuals with diverse basic education skills levels?

2. How does the program determine what prospective learners' skills needs, learning style and goals are? (What methods and approaches does the program regularly--and reliably--use in identifying prospective learners' existing and needed skills, preferred learning style, educational and personal goals?)

2a. How are prospective learners' educational plans developed? (What information--and process--is used in developing learners' educational plans, and who is involved in the process?)

3. How (and when) does the program identify potential barriers to prospective learners' participation in and completion of the program?

3a. What assistance does the program regularly offer prospective learners and their families once these barriers have been identified? (What internal and community support services and mechanisms are in place?)

4. Is there a reliable (effective) method the program uses in addressing (and lessening) learner absenteeism, and if so, what is the method?

PART TWO: Demonstrated Improvements in Learner Achievements, Program Quality and Community Development

INTERVIEW FOR STAFF (especially teachers/tutors)

FOCUS: Learner Achievement

1. What method/s does the program use to assist learners in identifying their individual goals? (How, and when, does the program assist learners in identifying/reflecting on their individual goals?)

2. Describe the methods and instruments used to assess learner need and evaluate learner achievement.

2a. How often do learner needs and skills assessments occur, and who is involved in the process?

3. Optional (as needed):

   Other than reviewing the results of standardized (and other) tests, how does the program know that learners have made progress? (What does the program consider in deciding whether or not learner achievement has occurred? What changes--which suggest growth--is the program looking for, and through what means can these changes be detected?)

4. What documents are regularly maintained that reflect learner achievement?

PART TWO: Demonstrated Improvements in Learner Achievements, Program Quality and Community Development

INTERVIEW FOR STAFF

FOCUS: Community Development

1. What are the key needs/issues/concerns of the community?

1a. How does the program address these needs/concerns?

2. Has the program's services and/or approaches changed to address community needs/issues, and if so, how?

2a. How has the program handled/responded to this change? (Who was involved in the process? What steps were used to initiate, implement and adjust to the change?)

3. How is your family/intergenerational literacy program different from others?

PART THREE: Processes and Structures for Program and Learner Development

INTERVIEW FOR STAFF

FOCUS: Learner Recruitment, Development and Retention

"Developing Critical Literacy"

1. How does the program ensure that learners regularly participate in literacy needs and skills assessment activities?

2. How does the program address specific (and diverse) learner skills needs? (What does the program consider in developing curricula, teaching philosophies, methods and approaches, selecting resources, etc.?)

3. How does the program address learners' specific problems/ issues? (What happens when learners identify problems or areas of specific interest/How does the program respond to learner-specific problems/issues?)

4. How do staff and learners work together to effectively broaden participants' knowledge and use of adult learning strategies and to increase their understanding of ways to integrate their literacy and life skills?

PART THREE: Processes and Structures for Program and Learner Development

INTERVIEW FOR STAFF

FOCUS: Learner Recruitment, Development and Retention

"Educational Planning"

1. How does the program strengthen learners' abilities to effectively plan and continue their education/training and/or seek employment after leaving the literacy program? (What mechanisms are in place to help learners effectively plan and implement meeting future education/training/employment goals?)

2. How (if applicable) does the program follow-up with former learners? (What tasks/activities are included in the program's follow-up system? How often/for how long does the program follow-up with former learners?)

2a. Why has the program's follow-up system been developed in this manner?

PART TWO: Demonstrated Improvements in Learner Achievements, Program Quality and Community Development

INTERVIEW FOR ADULT LEARNERS

FOCUS: Learner Achievement

1. How long have you been a participant in the family/intergenerational literacy program?

2. What do you want to accomplish by being in this program? (What are your goals for participating in this program/ What do you want to get from the program/How do you hope to change/grow from participating in this program?)

3. Since becoming a participant of the program, how do you feel you have benefited? (What have you gotten from the program so far?)

3a. How do you know you have benefited from the program? (What evidence/signs do you have that positive changes have occurred?)

4. Since becoming a participant of the program, how (if at all) has your involvement in the community changed? (In what community activities are you involved/What role/s do you play in the community?)

5. What are your employment goals, and how do you feel this program can/will assist you in meeting these goals?

(*Check to see if any participants are currently employed. If so, proceed with items 6-6a.)

6. Optional (as needed):

What work-related skills have you gained as a result of participating in the program?

6a. Optional (as needed):

How have these skills assisted you in achieving your employment goals? (What has been the result of having these new work-related skills?)

7. What are your future goals (educational, personally, family-related, etc.), and how do you plan to continue to achieve them?

PART TWO: Demonstrated Improvements in Learner Achievements, Program Quality and Community Development

INTERVIEW FOR YOUTH LEARNERS (school-aged)

FOCUS: Learner Achievement

1. What have you learned (or learned to do) from being in this program?

2. What types of things do you and your parent/s do together which help you do better in school?

2a. Did you and your parent/s do these things together before you started coming to the program?

3. How do you feel about learning with your parent/s?

4. In what other ways does this program help you? (What other things are you getting from the program?)

PART THREE: Processes and Structures for Program and Learner Development

INTERVIEW FOR PROGRAM COORDINATOR, STAFF AND ADULT LEARNERS

FOCUS: Learner Recruitment, Development and Retention

"Building Community Within the Program"

1. What types of activities (in addition to teaching and learning) do you participate in together?

2. How often do you participate in these activities together?

3. During joint activities, what responsibilities do you each (each group of you) have?

4. Do you feel safe and comfortable (physically and emotionally) in this learning environment and during what would be considered joint "social" activities, and if so, why? (What has been done to make you feel comfortable in this environment and with each other?)

4a. If you do not feel comfortable, why?

5. What are the strengths of this family/intergenerational literacy program? (What makes this program "good?")

6. What do you wish the program could do that it currently (due to various reasons) cannot?

PART THREE: Processes and Structures for Program and Learner Development

INTERVIEW FOR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR/BOARD MEMBER

FOCUS: Program Management and Fiscal Planning

1. How is it ensured that family/intergenerational literacy program activities and services occur as established by the program's mission, philosophy and goals?

2. How does the program ensure that appropriate information for learner needs assessments and skills evaluations is regularly collected?

3. How does the program develop its yearly financial plan? (Who is responsible for developing the yearly financial plan? What steps are taken/followed in the development of this plan?)

4. How does the program ensure that appropriate (based on General Accounting procedures) fiscal information is collected and maintained?

5. How does the program select its funding base? (What is considered in targeting and expanding sources of potential funding?)

APPENDIX F:

PROGRAM PROFILES

Note: Names which have asterisks (*) appearing after them denote Executive Directors or Program Coordinators who have left the organization since the completion of ACBE's field study.

Bronx Educational Services
965 Longwood Avenue, Room 309
Bronx, NY 10459
(718) 991-7310

Executive Director: Jon Deveaux

Bronx Educational Services (BES) is a non-profit organization located in the South Bronx which functions solely as a literacy education center. Incorporated in 1973, BES has been recognized as an innovative and exemplary program in the adult literacy field--with expertise in educating persons with little or no reading skills. It serves predominantly African Americans and other minority students of Latino and Caribbean origins, including teens and senior citizens, skilled workers and unemployed individuals, elementary school dropouts and high school graduates.

Bronx Educational Services is located in a community plagued by crime, drug use, AIDS and inadequate schools. Because of the poor quality of schools in the South Bronx--which once reported having a 71% high school drop out rate, the community is populated by generations of ill-prepared (and often dysfunctional) persons with limited literacy skills. In responding to the community's needs, BES provides adult literacy education and encourages advocacy and leadership skills development to promote self-sufficiency and empowerment.

Bronx Educational Services' family literacy program began in 1989 as a one-year pilot parent and child literacy project that would allow the organization to assess the impact of an intergenerational approach to education. Although the original pilot model included direct intervention with parents and children, the lack of space made it difficult to effectively serve both concurrently. Today, BES works directly with parents in an effort to positively change the lives of children. Its goals are to:

(1) Improve parenting skills;

(2) Increase literacy skills; and

(3) Help parents support their children in becoming strong readers, developing social-emotional skills, and progressing in school.

BES's family literacy program is content-based, respects and incorporates an awareness of cultural diversity, and promotes parents' interaction with and critical analysis of school systems. Adults participate as "students," "parents" and "teachers," enhancing their skills through discussing, reading and writing about their parenting experiences and concerns and

learning strategies to assist their children in the educational process.

Results of program participation include:

(1) Improved basic education skills;

(2) Increased effectiveness in parenting techniques;

(3) Increased self-esteem;

(4) Increased community involvement; and

(5) Parents' increased comfort with teaching, reading to and communicating with children.

Parents also report improvements in family relations and an increase in children reading as benefits of program participation.

FAMILY/INTERGENERATIONAL LITERACY PROGRAM PROFILE

Program Name: Bronx Educational Services Family Literacy Program

Direct Service/Intervention Focus: Parents

Program Length: 40 weeks (12 hours per week)

Major Support Services: Counseling, Advocacy, Community Support Service Agency Referrals

Staffing: Coordinator/Instructor (Carolyn Ferrell*)
Program Assistant (VISTA volunteer)

Special/Unique Features: (a) Affiliation with Reading is Fundamental (RIF), Inc. (provides free books to families)

(b) Publication of Students' Writing (internal and by Readers' House's New Writers' Voice series)

Curricula/Skills Developed: Basic Skills, Parenting, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving

Sample Activities/Approaches: (a) Group Reading Processes

(b) Parents Writing Letters to Their Children

(c) Writing and Sharing Family Histories

(d) Parents Maintaining a Record of What They Read with Their Children and the Results of Discussions with Children about Books

(e) Dialogue Journaling

Major Documentation: Individualized Student Record Forms, Dialogue Journals, Parents' Reading Files, Parents' Activity Logs, Quarterly Program Progress Reports

Assessment Instruments/Methods: Test of Adult Basic Education, The Coopersmith Inventory, BES Parent Log and Questionnaire, Parent as Teacher Inventory, Student Self-Evaluation, Anecdotal Data

Program Development Goals: (a) Improve recruitment and intake strategies.

(b) Formalize collaboration with prominent local parent organizing and advocacy group.

(c) Provide supplemental support services/staff (i.e., child care services, family advocacy, reading specialist, and clinical psychologist).

(d) Implement needs assessment as a part of all program cycle planning processes.

(e) Develop a more defined approach to evaluating student writing (e.g., student writing portfolios which assess needs, issues and changes).

(f) Devise more effective methods for documenting program impact.

(g) Reinforce linkages with community support service agencies.

(h) Increase learner responsibility in planning and executing RIF book distribution activities.

Community Action, Inc. of Hays, Caldwell, and Blanco Counties
Workforce Instructional Network
101 Uhland Road, Suite 206 Old Mill
P.O. Box 748
San Marcos, TX 78667
(512) 396-4564

Executive Director: Ofelia Vazquez

Community Action, Inc. of Hays, Caldwell, and Blanco Counties was established over 25 years ago through the efforts of a group of community leaders and volunteers who were committed to helping low-income, disadvantaged families improve the quality of their lives. It operates comprehensive Head Start programs designed to assist educationally and economically disadvantaged families in becoming successful community participants. Services and programs, which are provided to a predominantly adult female population of Hispanic origins (and their children), include full day care, a family service center, a collaboration program, family day homes, and an Even Start component, as well as outreach to the business community to assess employer needs and ensure that learners receive the education and training that will qualify them for existing and future jobs.

The most prevalent needs of persons served by Community Action, Inc. are transportation, affordable and appropriate health and child care. Also of primary concern to disadvantaged persons living in San Marcos is the way they are perceived (i.e., as having no work ethic because of their low-income status). Community Action responds to these issues through providing diversified family education, training in the home health care field, social services support programs and health care. It encourages social awareness and community action to promote change, and works to alter the business community's negative perception of disadvantaged persons.

Community Action, Inc.'s family literacy program is conducted through the organization's Workforce Instructional Network (WIN). In its original form, the program--once entitled Project PLUS (Parents Working for Us)--featured three components: parenting skills development (for parents of Head Start children), after-school tutoring, and adult education. Although the parenting education component was designed to provide intergenerational activities for adults and their preschool-aged children, parents had critical skills needs and personal problems that warranted separate attention before they could begin to assist their children. Many parents also had older, elementary school-aged children--which lessened the need for early childhood education. WIN's incorporation of a parenting-based reading and writing course that concurrently facilitated the development of parenting and literacy skills was a major response to the needs of adult participants.

Currently supported by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, WIN's family literacy program has made some alterations in its approach. With the development of its Head Start Family Service Center (WINFSC)--located in Chapultepec Homes (a newly-renovated public housing project), WIN now provides literacy and employability skills training and drug awareness services to families through a collaboration with Southwest Texas State University. Although the first two years of the program will primarily focus on building parents' academic and employability skills, the third year will engage parents in community development initiatives and learning how to be more directly involved in their children's education.

WIN's primary objective is to prepare Head Start parents to obtain good jobs that will increase family self-sufficiency and enhance parents' capacities to be their children's "first teachers." Basic skills instruction is job-related, emphasizing the numeracy and literacy requirements of local jobs. Through the implementation of a case management system, the Family Services Center encourages the development of appropriate family and work-related behaviors. The instructional model encompasses the following four principles:

(1) Focusing learning activities on specific issues of interest (i.e., learner-centered);

(2) Building on learners' strengths;

(3) Demonstrating the relevance of issues being addressed; and

(4) Modeling and discussing skills building strategies.

Among the results of participation in the WINFSC are parents' improved self-esteem and basic education skills. By illustrating the importance of education, parents feel they have become better role models for their children. Additionally, the exposure to computer technology (for basic skills development and reinforcement, and word processing) has increased parents' eligibility for employment.

Parents also report that, since enrolling in the program, they have become more vocal about their frustrations with the Welfare System and Public Housing Authorities, are participating in community action discussions and activities, speaking publicly and exploring ways to assist other families and individuals within their community.

FAMILY/INTERGENERATIONAL LITERACY PROGRAM PROFILE

Program Name: Workforce Instructional Network Head Start Family Service Center

Direct Service/Intervention Focus: Parents

Program Length: Non-Specified (open-entry/open-exit)

Major Support Services: On-Site Child Care, Transportation, Community Support Service Agency Referrals

Staffing: Project Director (Jonathan Engel)
Instructional Coordinator
Case Management Coordinator
2 Adult Education Instructors (1 bilingual)
Child Care Workers
Social Work/Services Interns
Secretary
Administrative Aide

Special/Unique Features:

(a) Program Location in Public Housing Project

(b) Flexible Scheduling (morning, afternoon and evening sessions)

(c) Integrated Job and Basic Education Skills-Related Goal-Setting and Action Planning

(d) Case Management System

(e) Supplemental Computer-Based Instruction

Curricula/Skills Developed: Basic Skills, Employability Skills, Parenting and Life Skills, English Education (ESL), Substance Abuse Awareness, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving

Sample Activities/Approaches:

(a) Collaborative Learning Projects

(b) Practical Application of Basic Skills in Daily Life Situations

(c) Sharing of Personal Life Experiences

Major Documentation: Adult Education Records, Long- and Short-Range Goals Sheets, Monthly/Quarterly/Annual Program Progress Reports

Assessment Instruments/Methods: Hadley Press Adult Indicator, Action Series (ESL), GED Practice Tests, Case Management Notations, Student Self-Evaluations, Anecdotal Data

Program Development Goals:

(a) Continue education of public and private sectors regarding the needs and skills of disadvantaged persons.

(b) Improve relationships with public schools.

(c) Establish formal student program exit procedures.

(d) Systematize former student progress monitoring.

(e) Create a baby-sitting cooperative managed by parents.

The Denver Indian Center, Inc.
4407 Morrison Road
Denver, CO 80219
(303) 936-2688 or 937-1005

Executive Director: Arlene Rhoades* (Acting Director)

The Denver Indian Center (DIC), Inc. serves as a major resource for Native American individuals and families in Colorado. Incorporated as a non-profit agency in 1983, DIC functions in a multi-service capacity, providing Adult Basic Education, GED preparation, employment training and placement, early childhood education, family and computer literacy, social and human services, and a senior citizens' program. Presently, DIC's Adult Basic Education program is the only program in Colorado specifically designed to address the educational needs of Native American adults who are in transition from the reservations. Known for its professional and culturally sensitive approach, the Center often attracts individuals who live in geographic areas as far as 20 miles away.

Many of the issues of concern to the community revolve around the lack or insufficiency of basic life needs (e.g., health care, housing, education, employment, food and transportation). Drug and alcohol abuse is not uncommon, and many Native American parents do not feel equipped to successfully raise their children in a culture so unlike their own.

Because they often lack the self-esteem needed to improve their lives, Native Americans living in Denver's cities experience difficulty in seeking assistance to address their concerns. The Denver Indian Center responds to the community by providing an array of emergency and other life needs services in a culturally sensitive environment. The Center offers rental assistance, food, clothing, and shelter referrals. It maintains an extensive community services resource list which includes agencies equipped to effectively address domestic, societal and health needs and problems (e.g., substance abuse and rehabilitation, domestic violence, civil rights issues and child youth services). It provides a safe classroom atmosphere designed to build skills and increase cultural and self-pride, and life skills classes to help students adjust to urban settings, understand their legal rights and improve consumer skills. Additionally, DIC's Employment and Training Skills Program enhances students' employability by providing vocational skills training and short-term work experience, and educating local employers about Native Americans and their value as workers.

In 1988, The Denver Indian Center's Adult Basic Education Program was awarded a grant from the Colorado Department of Education's Special Projects Division to develop a family

literacy program. The program, organized in conjunction with DIC's Circle of Learning Program (which provides early childhood education and parenting skills instruction), is primarily based on two components: Reinforcing Educational Activities Daily (READ) and Oral Traditions. Based on the premise that the entire family must take an active role in educating its children, the program teaches adults how to help children strengthen their reading, oral and written communications skills. Core activities of the READ and Oral Traditions components are designed to accomplish the following:

(1) Enhance basic education and critical thinking skills;

(2) Teach Native American cultural traditions, values and customs; and

(3) Research and document tribal histories and existing traditions to be passed to future generations.

Funding in 1990 from the Coors Family Literacy Foundation supported the development of a curriculum, based on DIC's work, that would reinforce reading, writing and oral communications skills in a culturally appropriate manner. Developed in partnership with the Coors Foundation, the curriculum--entitled "Old Wisdom, New Knowledge--became a major focus of the Center's family literacy program, resulting in a 1991 National Conference training on implementing the model within Native American (and other) communities. The curriculum, which is not used strictly at DIC, but serves as a "guide" for the Center's family literacy program, is comprised of four parts:

(1) READ (Living in Harmony with Self and Others);

(2) Oral Traditions (Remembering the Past);

(3) READ (Living in Harmony with Animals and Mother Earth); and

(4) Oral Traditions (Looking Toward the Future).

Parents in DIC's family literacy program report several positive outcomes of participation, including the unification of the family structure, parents' increased self-esteem and effectiveness as teachers and disciplinarians, and their improved relations with children and other adults. Parents also relate that their children read more, behave better and are more interested in learning. Adults contribute the success of the program to its relaxed atmosphere, the approachability and encouragement of staff, the social activities and concentration on cultural history and traditions--which has made the program

more relevant to their livess.

FAMILY/INTERGENERATIONAL LITERACY PROGRAM PROFILE

Program Name: "Old Wisdom, New Knowledge" Family Literacy Program

Direct Service/Intervention Focus: Parent/Child Combination

Program Length: Non-Specified (open-entry/open-exit)

Major Support Services: Transportation Assistance, Counseling, Tutoring, Emergency Life Needs Assistance/Crisis Intervention, Community Support Service Agency Referrals

Staffing: Program Coordinator (Lynda Nuttall)
Instructor

NOTE: Additional instructors and VISTA volunteers assist adult family literacy program participants who are also enrolled in the Center's ABE/GED and computer literacy classes.

Special/Unique Features:

(a) Whole Language Learning Approach

(b) Four Component, Culturally-Based Curriculum

(c) Total Family Involvement in Education of Children

(d) Home- and Center-Based Family Learning Activities

(e) Family Literacy Resource Library (magazines, films, and books written by and about Native Americans)

Curricula/Skills Developed: Basic Skills, Native American History/Cultural Traditions/Values/ Customs, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving

Sample Activities and Approaches:

(a) Reading/Telling Stories with Native American Themes

(b) Family Writing Activities

(c) Using Art Mediums to Express Ideas About or Understanding of Main Class Themes

(d) Monthly Theme-Related Class Trips

(e) Family Journal Writing

(f) Circle Reading (all participants reading, in turn, from the same book)

Major Documentation: Skills Profile Sheets, Instructor's Class Activity/Planning Journal, Student Program Evaluations, Program Progress Reports

Assessment Instruments/Methods: Test of Adult Basic Education, San Diego Assessment or Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System, GED Practice Tests, Family Activity Folders, Student Self-Evaluations, Anecdotal Data

Program Development Goals: (a) Enhance program intake procedures (i.e., more concentration on helping individual families identify the goals of and barriers to their participation)

(b) Establish a mentoring program (for all participants of the Adult Basic Education Program) to provide support to persons interested in attending college.

(c) Provide services to infants and children under 3 years old.

(d) Incorporate regular planning/ administration time into teacher's work schedule.

(e) Expand resource library to include information about other cultures.

(f) Develop a formal system for assessing participants' progress after they have completed/exited the Center's program/s.

Dorcas Place Parent Literacy Center, Inc.
270 Elmwood Avenue
Providence, RI 02907
(401) 273-8866

Executive Director: Mary Reilly

Dorcas Place Parent Literacy Center, Inc. is a private, non-profit organization which serves educationally and economically disadvantaged adults and single parents. Dorcas Place's service population is predominantly comprised of females of Hispanic and Asian origins, Native and African Americans. Founded in 1981 as a literacy instruction center, it provides a host of programs and services designed to support "the total family." Dorcas Place's programs and services include center- and home-based tutoring, an "alternative learners" program (for learning disabled persons), intermediate basic literacy instruction, an intergenerational and family literacy program, pre-GED/pre-vocational and GED instruction--including a special segment for men. It additionally provides an Independent Living program, a social services counseling and referral system, a Maternal-Child Health program, parenting and early childhood education.

Reportedly, Rhode Island has one of the highest high school dropout rates in the United States. Consequently, it has significant adult illiteracy. Persons who live within Dorcas Place's service community are exposed to drug use and crime. Many lack jobs, have no transportation, and have housing and child care needs which hinder their participation in education and skills training programs. Dorcas Place's approach to addressing the needs and concerns of the community combines education, advocacy, specialized instruction, counseling, supportive programs and services. Instruction is individualized to meet each student's needs. The Social Services Unit helps students eliminate conditions which impede their participation. Through special services like the Maternal-Child Health program, pregnant and new mothers can receive in-home basic skills instruction related to life skills and parenting concepts such as infant care, family health and nutrition. Additionally, in order to improve the quality of life for all disadvantaged persons, the Center promotes individual and public awareness of the population's needs and advocates for equitable, appropriate and timely government assistance.

Dorcas Place's Parent-Child Education Program serves as the child care and development component which supports parents who are enrolled in the Center's literacy, ABE and GED classes. Structured to promote the development of parents and children alike, the program focuses on parenting techniques, early child development strategies and parent-child activities which foster children's language, motor and social skills growth. The "parent as first teacher" concept is the basis of Dorcas Place's family

literacy work. Instruction is holistic and content-based, incorporating parenting and life skills issues into the framework of improving reading, writing, listening, computation and oral communication skills. The program provides one-on-one tutoring and group instruction. It promotes social awareness and the development of critical thinking and problem solving skills and educates adults to be advocates for themselves and their children.

In 1991, Dorcas Place expanded the parenting program to include an intergenerational literacy component--the Family Reading program. Funded by the Rhode Island Department of Education, the new component created a more structured approach to improving the basic education skills of parents while increasing their interest and abilities in engaging their children in interactive reading, writing and listening activities. Today, the program is integrated with the Center's Parent-Child Education component.

Although Parent-Child Education is more readily identified with the concept of "family literacy," all of Dorcas Place's educational programs have a family/intergenerational focus. Whether working with parents and their children or with parents alone, Dorcas Place's primary goal is to strengthen the capacity of parents and other primary caregivers to promote/enhance intergenerational basic skills proficiency.

Results of participation in Dorcas Place's educational programs vary. Because of learners' skills level differences, achievements/indicators of progress may include very basic things--such as learning how to spell a child's name--to developing academic skills well enough to allow parents to help their children with homework. Parents report improvements in their life skills, as evidenced by their abilities to read signs, fill out applications and checks, pay bills and better manage their money. They feel that they have become role models for their children; have improved reading, writing, math and oral communication skills; have established personal and educational goals and increased their self-esteem. Additionally, they have been introduced to the library, theatre and other cultural activities that they now share with their families.

FAMILY/INTERGENERATIONAL LITERACY PROGRAM PROFILE

Program Name: Parent-Child Education/Family Reading Program

Direct Service/Intervention Focus: Parent/Child Combination

Program Length: 52 weeks (4 hours per week)

NOTE: Most adult participants are concurrently enrolled in other Dorcas Place educational programs.

Major Support Services: Transportation Assistance, On-Site Child Care, Emergency Assistance, Community Support Service Agency Referrals, Social Services Counseling

Staffing: Education Program Coordinator (Judy Titzel)
Social Services, Student, and Volunteer Coordinators
1-2 Instructors for Each Educational Component
Interns
Administrative Assistant
Volunteers

NOTE: Staffing specifications include all educational components.

Special/Unique Features:

(a) Multi-Level Literacy and Basic Skills Instruction

(b) Specialized Instruction for Learning Disabled Students

(c) On-Site Parent and Child Education and Development

(d) Integration of Computer-Based Instruction at All Instructional Levels

(e) On-Site Social Services Unit Managed by a Full-Time, Credentialed (MSW) Director and Supported by Social Work Interns

(f) Case Management System

Curricula/Skills Developed: Basic Skills, Parenting, Children's Language/Motor/Social Skills Development (infants and toddlers/ preschoolers), Critical Thinking and Problem Solving

Sample Activities/Approaches:

(a) Interactive Family Reading, Writing and Listening

(b) Instructor and Parent Observations to Assess Child Behavior,

Development and Needs and the Quality of Parent-Child Interactions

(c) Hands-On, Practical Application of Parenting Strategies and Techniques

Major Documentation: Basic Literacy Profiles, Child Observation Checklists, Program Evaluations (learners, staff, tutors and classroom volunteers), Monthly/Quarterly/Annual Program Progress Reports

Assessment Instruments/Methods: Gates-MacGinite Reading Test, Bangor Dyslexia Test (as needed), Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System, Slosson Oral Reading Test, Writing Sample, Child Observation Checklist and Post-Assessment Quiz, Student Portfolios, Student Self-Evaluations, Anecdotal Data

Program Development Goals: (a) Expand funding base to lessen dependency on state money.

(b) Increase efforts to educate the private sector about Center's work and the people it serves.

(c) Continue to create and strengthen new and existing partnerships with community and other support agencies and organizations.

(d) Increase advocacy work.

(e) Develop a student alumni association.

(f) Implement participatory structures and processes in all aspects of the organization.

Dover Adult Learning Center
22 Atkinson Street
Dover, NH 03820
(603) 742-1030

Executive Director: Debbie Tasker

Dover Adult Learning Center (DALC) is a private, non-profit agency that works in cooperation with the Dover, New Hampshire Department of Education to provide adult and community education in Strattford County. Incorporated in 1972, DALC offers a variety of programs and services, including Adult Basic Education, English as a Second Language, and Adult High School Diploma classes, GED preparation, family and workplace literacy, vocational education, and support groups and skills training for displaced homemakers. DALC, which serves predominantly white, single, female heads-of-household, has been recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education for its work in improving basic academic skills. In designing and operating all of its programs, the Dover Adult Learning Center board and staff adhere to the following principles:

(1) "Treat participants with respect;

(2) Individualize instruction;

(3) Remove barriers to participation;

(4) Seek the development of each participant to his or her fullest potential; and

(5) Emphasize opportunities for least-educated adults."

The most prevalent community need in Dover is employment. With the relocation of a major local milling site and the threat to close another, residents are concerned about future work opportunities. For persons who are welfare recipients, the employment issue poses another concern--the potential loss of needed health (and other) benefits. Although many public assistance recipients want to work, they often have difficulties securing jobs which provide adequate wages and benefits which will help them become truly self-sufficient. In responding to these issues, Dover Adult Learning Center promotes education and training as the primary paths to achieving economic self-sufficiency, understanding community needs and how to effect change. For example, DALC provided basic education and job skills training to workers who lost employment during the mill's closing. Additionally, DALC offers support, resource referrals and guidance to students who express interest in developing community programs to assist other educationally and economically disadvantaged persons.

The Dover Adult Learning Center's Early Start Family Literacy Program (ESFaLP) was started in 1991 in response to DALC students' requests to learn how to support their children in the educational process. Originally supported by federal Adult Basic Education funds, DALC developed a 5-month pilot family literacy program (for 6 families) based on a home visit structure which emphasized literacy enhancement activities that parents could participate in with their children. Following the initial piloting, parents expressed a need to expand the program. Recognizing that they too had basic academic skills that required development and/or reinforcement, parents wanted the program to include a separate "study time" to allow them opportunities to work on improving their basic skills while their children were engaged in other learning activities.

In its current form, the program incorporates modeling activities designed to assist adults in teaching, reading and relating to their children, uses a home visit worker trained to identify and respond to indicators of first language acquisition development, and increases parents' awareness of family literacy needs and skills enhancement opportunities. The model also provides learner-centered, individualized instruction through an adult education component (Study Time/Study Circle)--which allows parents to improve their basic education skills, establish and address personal and job-related goals, discuss topics of importance and learn to use literacy in practical, life situations--and provides, in addition to parent-child time, separate, age-specific reading and learning activities for children 4 months to 4 years old.

For parents, participation in the Early Start Family Literacy Program has produced significant results. Parents read more with their preschool-aged children, and have improved their parenting and child teaching skills. Consequently, adults find that they spend more productive time with their children, are more conscious of their children's development, and are able to communicate more effectively with older children--especially when discussing critical issues, such as drugs and sex. Staff and parents cite the adult education/support component of the program for being instrumental in helping parents improve their basic skills and obtain their GED's--and for giving adults a forum to discuss community development issues. Parents also relate that they have become more focused in their educational planning, allowing them to better understand the processes for achieving specific job and career goals.

FAMILY/INTERGENERATIONAL LITERACY PROGRAM PROFILE

Program Name: Early Start Family Literacy Program

Direct Service/Intervention Focus: Parent/Child Combination

Program Length: Non-Specified (4-6 hours per week, open-entry/open-exit)

NOTE: Most adult participants are concurrently enrolled in Dover's basic education classes.

Major Support Services: Child Care (provided through baby-sitting cooperative), Baby-Sitting Cooperative Stipends, Transportation, Community Support Service Agency Referrals

Staffing: Program Coordinator/Instructor (Rebecca Perham)
Home Visit Literacy Aide
VISTA Volunteer

Special/Unique Features:
(a) Home- and Center-Based Family Literacy Instruction
(b) Child Education/Development Component
(c) Library Story Times
(d) Flexible Family Scheduling

Curricula/Skills Developed: Basic Skills, Parenting and Life Skills, Children's Language/Motor/Social Skills Development

Sample Activities/Approaches:
(a) Modeling Activities which Illustrate How to Read to, Teach, Play and Communicate with Children
(b) Illustrating Daily Life Activities which Can Foster Learning
(c) Practical Application of Basic Skills in Daily Life Situations

Major Documentation: Home Visit Log Books, Parent and Child Portfolios, Student Surveys, Program Evaluations, Program Progress Reports

Assessment Instruments/Methods: Test of Adult Basic Education, Student Writing, Student Self-Evaluations, Anecdotal Data

Program Development Goals:

(a) Develop a summer workshop series for parents which will address issues of their interests, needs and concerns.

(b) Expand the program volunteer's role to include conducting needs assessments.

(c) Enhance program recruitment procedures, including current and former learners in a more active, responsible role.

(d) Enhance collaborative program and problem solving efforts with county Head Start Program.

(e) Enhance documentation practices and procedures.

The Family Place, Inc. (Mount Pleasant Site)
3309 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20010
(202) 265-0149

Executive Director: Maria Elena Orrego*

The Family Place, Inc., which operates two facilities in the District of Columbia, is a non-profit organization which serves as a drop-in center for high risk, low-income families. During the 12-year history of its Mount Pleasant site, the center--which targets its services to expectant parents and families with children up to three years old--has worked to improve the health and development of children and their parents through increasing family stability and support. The Family Place's Mount Pleasant facility predominantly serves Central Americans. It delivers comprehensive social services provided through an established collaborative network of approximately 60 community support service agencies. The center's other services and programs include counseling; family planning information and referral; parenting education workshops and support groups; English as a Second Language (ESL), adult and family literacy classes; child language development training; and a Special Babies program--which offers social services and counseling to families with handicapped infants.

For recently immigrated Central Americans living in D.C.'s Mount Pleasant area--most of whom are isolated from the mainstream culture because they do not understand English, there is an urgent need to become English language proficient. The majority of the Mount Pleasant Family Place (MPFP) participants are young families with very small children. Parents at the center have limited education and training--which result in their employment in unskilled, low-waged jobs. The combination of limited English skills and job opportunities, and a lack of understanding of community support service systems, and cultural differences in parenting techniques contributes to the frustration of many who come to America in search of a better life.

To address the issues of the community it serves, the Family Place provides competency-based programs designed to foster the development of "the total family," strengthen basic English language and literacy skills, encourage community building and support within the learning environment, and incorporate themes which reflect families' specific needs and interests. Additionally, MPFP acts as a conduit through which families are connected to other resource agencies and supports parents' goals to enhance their employability and survival skills by relating English language learning to various work and life situations.

Family literacy at MPFP is not a separate entity, but one component in the center's multi-faceted approach to supporting the family unit. Formally in existence for two years, the family literacy component evolved because of Spanish literacy adults' concerns about not being able to communicate with their children's teachers or understand and assist their children with homework. MPFP responded to parents' needs by developing an ESL class (now in its sixth year). The class, intended to strengthen the capacity of parents to support their children in the educational process, included literacy education and parenting skills enhancement. Although the ESL class had a family focus, the center did not identify it as a "family literacy program." Approaches to learning and using English were very traditional, with no special attention being given to child development. English and parenting skills classes were held separately, and little--if any--input from learners was used in program planning.

Today, MPFP's family literacy component serves both ESL and Spanish literacy students and integrates child development knowledge with parenting and language literacy skills enhancement. It is participatory to encourage parents to be leaders and to take more responsibility for their own education, and encourages total family participation in activities that will strengthen basic education proficiencies. Priorities of the family literacy component are two-fold:

(1) "To teach adults according to their goals and plans; and

(2) To support adults in learning how to teach their children.

MPFP uses a small group, learner-centered educational approach, encouraging adults to identify issues of specific interest related to parenting and basic English/literacy skills development. End-of-cycle student self-evaluations are based on students' predetermined educational goals, and are, therefore, subject to change each term. Although MPFP's family literacy component is structured to primarily accommodate parents and their children in separate learning/developmental activities, parent-child time is regularly scheduled to promote family interaction.

ESL education students report that they have learned to use English for several basic life skills activities (e.g., providing personal identification information, answering basic questions, greeting people, and making emergency telephone calls). Those who are working indicate that they are better able to understand and respond to directives from supervisors. Although adults' English skills are not currently proficient enough to allow them to teach their children English beyond a minimal degree, they feel that MPFP's capacity to simultaneously accommodate all family members has strengthened the family unit.

FAMILY/INTERGENERATIONAL LITERACY PROGRAM PROFILE

Program Name: Untitled

Direct Service/Intervention Focus: Parent/Child Combination

Program Length: 12 weeks (Spanish Literacy: 4 hours per week, ESL: 12 hours per week; re-enrollment option)

Major Support Services: On-Site Child Care, Transportation Assistance, Counseling, Social Sevices and Emergency Assistance, Daily Meals (breakfast and lunch), Community Support Service Agency Referrals

Staffing: Program Coordinator (Christine McKay)
2 Spanish Literacy Instructors
3 ESL Instructors
2 Child Care Workers

NOTE: Staffing specifications include Spanish, ESL and family literacy components.

Special/Unique Features:
(a) Family Literacy Component Integrated into ESL and Spanish Literacy Classes
(b) Parent-Child Story Hours
(c) Extensive Social Services Support Network
(d) Case Management System

Curricula/Skills Developed: English Education (ESL), Spanish Literacy, Parenting, Child Development

Sample Activities/Approaches:
(a) Encourages Writing and Speaking in Whole Sentences Early in Language Literacy Education
(b) Participatory Group Learning Processes
(c) Writing about Personal Experiences, Family Histories and Culture
(d) Creating Family Trees and Collages

(e) Monthly Family Visits to Library

Major Documentation: Comprehensive Intake Forms (for families requiring either long- or short-term support), Family Case Worker Reports, Student Program Evaluations, Bi-Annual Program Progress Reports

Assessment Instruments/Methods: Basic English Skills Test, Student Self-Evaluations, Teacher Evaluations, Anecdotal Data

Program Development Goals:

(a) Improve procedures for monitoring the progress of former students.

(b) Create processes and structures to promote increased learner involvement in program planning and operation.

(c) Train additional program participants as literacy teachers (to increase number of learners that can be enrolled during educational cycles).

(d) Incorporate planning/administration time into teachers' work schedules.

(e) Establish a family support network (to improve community services to low-income Spanish-speaking families).

Germantown Women's Educational Project
c/o Calvary Church, Germantown
5020 Pulaski Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19144
(215) 843-2148

Executive Director: Peggy McGuire

The Germantown Women's Educational Project (GWEP) was founded in 1985 to address the needs of undereducated, economically disadvantaged women. GWEP, whose service population is primarily comprised of African American women and their infant to preschool-aged children, provides Adult Basic Education and GED preparation classes, individual and group counseling, family learning and career readiness programs. Since its inception, it has offered learner-centered, community-based educational and support programs designed to alleviate social, cultural and class barriers and promote individual, family and community development. At GWEP, learners are active participants in all aspects of the organization. They work on collaborative projects with staff and community volunteers to develop curricula, research community support service agencies to provide resource information, plan educational activities, and function as members of GWEP's "community" board.

Women residing in the southwest Germantown section of Philadelphia need affordable, quality housing for themselves and their families. Within the community, drug and alcohol abuse is prevalent, and disadvantaged families often do not have access to (or take advantage of) appropriate health care services. Because many of the women have not completed school, they also feel ill-equipped to assist their children with school assignments--contributing further to their feelings of inadequacy and low self-esteem.

The Germantown Women's Educational Project addresses the needs of community women by providing education and supportive services, promoting social awareness, and fostering the realization of participants' self-worth, strengths and leadership abilities. Curricula are relevant to participants' needs, issues and interests and incorporate activities which promote critical analysis and problem solving. Students are encourgaed to direct their own education and development by identifying and planning learning tasks and implementing workshops, special projects and community action strategies to effect change.

GWEP's family literacy program was developed in response to learners' expressed concerns about how to be effective parents, grandparents and other caregivers of children. Recurring issues of concern revolved around the health care system; how to advocate for appropriate, quality education for children; discipline and punishment; and access to community resources

designed to support the family unit. Adhering to its belief that literacy instruction should be contextual (i.e., with regard to the interests, needs and aspirations of learners), GWEP created a program model that specifically addressed parenting issues while concurrently enhancing reading, writing, oral communication, math and critical thinking skills. Initially, the program was untitled. The concept of parenting education became a natural component of basic skills instruction. However, as the frequency of parenting-related issues increased in daily learning, it became evident to the organization that the program had to be more clearly defined. In 1991, GWEP received a grant from the Association for Community Based Education (ACBE) to accomplish this objective.

Entitled "Family Life and Learning," the ACBE-funded project was implemented to allow GWEP to expand its efforts by:

(1) Assembling a team of adult educators, early child care specialists, learners and social service providers to develop a learning plan designed to increase students' academic skills and readiness to take the GED exam;

(2) Providing six hours of weekly instruction in basic education, life skills and parenting;

(3) Developing a network of community resources (e.g., curricula materials, technical assistance and direct support services, and workshop facilitators);

(4) Providing free, quality child care; and

(5) Involving parents/other primary caregivers and their children in multi-generational learning activities.

Today, the program promotes the concept of "lifelong learning" for all members of the family. Because parents are children's primary role models, the organization supports caregivers in developing skills which will allow them to help their children learn and appreciate the value of education. To promote parents' understanding of the learning experience as one which involves sharing, listening and supporting, all learning, decision-making, program planning and evaluation are participatory. Program success is measured by the extent to which learners have achieved the goals they establish, are able to assess their achievement and evaluate the program's effectiveness in facilitating individual, family and community development.

Learners in GWEP's Family Life and Learning progam have made essential achievements in various aspects of their lives. They

report improvements in critical thinking, reading, writing, and math (basic and advanced) skills; employment gains; involvement in community action activities; enhanced relationships with family members; readiness to take the GED exam; and increased self-esteem. Parents have also improved their skills as caregivers. They feel focused and responsible in their roles as care providers, have learned non-physical ways to discipline and set limits with their children, know strategies for helping children build their self-confidence, and understand the connection between their educational attainment and that of their offspring.

FAMILY/INTERGENERATIONAL LITERACY PROGRAM PROFILE

Program Name: Family Life and Learning

Direct Service/Intervention Focus: Parent/Child Combination

Program Length: 34 weeks (17 hours per week)

Major Support Services: On-Site Child Care, Counseling, Advocacy (child/youth services), Support Groups, Community Support Service Agency Referrals

Staffing: Program Coordinator/Director (Peggy McGuire)
Director's Assistant
3 Instructors
Child Care Worker
Social Services Worker
Volunteers

Special/Unique Features:
(a) Curriculum Developed by Team of Learners, Adult Educators, Child Care Specialists and Social Services Providers

(b) Comprehensive Student Self-Assessment and Goal-Setting Process

(c) Multi-Generational Learning Activities

(d) Participatory Learning, Program Planning and Evaluation

Curricula/Skills Developed: Basic Skills, Parenting and Life Skills, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving

Sample Activities/Approaches:

(a) Learner-Identified "Group Theme" for Skills Enhancement Activities

(b) Group Learning Processes

(c) "Warm-Up" Activities (e.g., word games and math puzzles)

(d) Brainstorming, Free Writing and Collage-Making

(e) Using Family-Based Poetry Authored by Persons of Diverse Ethnic/Racial Backgrounds and Experiences (to generate discussion of parenting and family life experiences)

Major Documentation: Student Goals Sheets, Learning Logs/Dialogue Journals, Teacher Journals, Narrative Reports on Learners, Program Evaluations (learners and staff), Program Progress Reports

Assessment Instruments/Methods: Student Self-Evaluations, GED Practice Tests, Teacher/Staff Evaluations, Anecdotal Data

Program Development Goals:

(a) Evaluate and improve strategies and approaches to increasing intergenerational literacy.

(b) Incorporate use of portfolio assessment techniques.

(c) Document and provide resource information on local employment skills training programs.

(d) Systematize the monitoring of former students' progress (to assess and document long-range impact of program participation).

The Neighborhood Institute
1750 East 71st Street
Chicago, IL 60649
(312) 684-4610

President: Dorris Pickins

The Neighborhood Institute (TNI) is a non-profit community development organization affiliated with the Shorebank Corporation, a regulated bank holding company based in Chicago's South Shore area. Established in 1978, TNI serves the predominantly African American, low- to moderate-income communities of South Shore (the south side) and Austin (the west side). During its 15-year history, TNI has maintained a strong commitment to community revitalization. A multi-service agency, The Neighborhood Institute provides literacy and Adult Basic Education classes; GED preparation; a family learning program; cultural activities; property ownership and management training; a Senior Home Repair program; workshops, seminars, publications and consultative services which address such issues as property rehabilitation, financing, organizational structure and policies.

Similar to many densely populated and improverished inner-city areas, Chicago's South Shore community is plagued by gang activity, drug and alcohol abuse. Many adults in the community lack jobs and affordable housing, have low literacy levels, and are raising children who begin to fall behind early in academics and drop out of high school at an alarming rate. Lacking self-esteem and adequate basic skills themselves, many parents are ill-equipped to assist their children in achieving academically.

In addressing the needs of the community, The Neighborhood Institute focuses on providing services which develop human potential and build self-confidence. Through education and training, social service intervention and support, TNI works to increase the community's chances for becoming economically self-sufficient. Adult education classes are provided at three levels of instruction (basic, intermediate and advanced). TNI's Entrepreneurial Division, which assists persons interested in creating small businesses, provides training in developing business plans, financing, management and marketing. The Institute's Real Estate Development Division purchases and rehabilitates deteriorated residential and commercial properties for occupancy, while its Community Service Division promotes advocacy, tenant organizing and leadership, information dissemination, neighborhood planning, community clean-up and safety strategies. TNI also encourages businesses to relocate to struggling commercial districts to create job opportunities and stimulate economic growth.

In 1988, The Neighborhood Institute began a literacy program to meet the needs of adults who read below the 5th grade level.

The adults, many of whom were parents, often brought their children to class because of lack of reliable and affordable child care. In observing adults and their children together, TNI staff realized that parents enrolled in the class were not prepared to help their children in the educational process. Two years later, TNI developed a family and intergenerational literacy program to address the problem.

Entitled "Partnerships: Adults and Children Together (PACE)," the program was structured to assist families in several ways, including:

(1) Improving the basic education skills of adult participants;

(2) Increasing children's chances for achieving academic success;

(3) Strengthening families' abilities to address internal problems; and

(4) Empowering welfare dependent and low-income families to improve the quality of their lives --as well as that of "the larger community."

Parents were encouraged to become advocates for their children, to investigate school programs and activities, stay informed about their children's performance, and participate in coalitions to improve education in their community.

In 1991, supported by a small grant from the Association for Community Based Education (ACBE), TNI enhanced the PACT program with its "PACT Around Town" project. "PACT Around Town," whose objectives were similar to PACT's, was targeted to serve single, low-income parents and their elementary school-aged children. Participants visited local places of interest which promoted art appreciation and cultural awareness, planned and evaluated family field trips. Pre- and post-trip activities were incorporated to encourage participants to socialize, express themselves creatively, and think critically about their experiences.

Today, PACT is in another developmental stage. Recently, TNI has entered a collaboration with City College of Chicago, the Boys and Girls Club of Chicago, and IBM to provide individualized computer-based education in math, reading and grammar, technical skills training and tutoring. The revised program maintains its original objectives and includes enrichment activities designed to encourage family interaction and learning, exposure to and awareness of other life styles, cultures and experiences; however, in addition to providing services to adults, it now serves children and youth from preschool age to 21 years old. It promotes student responsibility (through goal-setting and

planning), leadership, problem solving and life skills development, and stimulates learning through the use of games, field trips, discussions and innovative classroom activities.

Adult PACT participants report significant progress since enrolling in the program. Improvements in reading, writing, math and grammar skills are evidenced by adults' increased vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension, and promotions in computer-based academic skills development programs. Overall, adults feel more comfortable with the educational process and have better attitudes toward learning. They read to their children more often, are able to help their children with homework, and are more active in community activities (e.g., church volunteerism, neighborhood crime prevention and revitalization projects).

FAMILY/INTERGENERATIONAL LITERACY PROGRAM PROFILE

Program Name: Partnerships: Adults and Children Together

Direct Service/Intervention Focus: Parent/Child Combination

Program Length: Non-Specified (2-12 hours per week; open-entry/ open-exit)

Major Support Services: Child Care Provider Assistance, Counseling, Housing and Job Placement Assistance, Tutoring, Community Support Service Agency Referrals

Staffing: Education/Volunteer Coordinator (Barbara Searles)
Literacy Instructor
ABE/GED Instructor
Volunteer Tutors

Special/Unique Features:
(a) Multi-Level Classroom and Computer-Based Instruction
(b) Late Afternoon and Evening Class Sessions
(c) Cultural Enrichment Activities
(d) Child Education Support
(e) Learning Resource Library (for learner and staff use)

Curricula/Skills Developed: Basic Skills, Parenting and Life Skills, Critical Thinking

Sample Activities/Approaches: (a) Modeling Activities to Teach Parents How to Read to and Teach Children

(b) Family Learning Activities

(c) Practical Application of Basic Skills in Daily Life Situations

(d) Participants' Planning and Evaluation of Cultural Enrichment, Pre- and Post-Field Trip Activities

Major Documentation: Personal Data Forms, Individualized Education Plans, Student Portfolios, Children's Individualized Work Plans, Student Program Evaluations, Computer-Generated Skills Progress Reports, Program Progress Reports

Assessmemt Instruments/Methods: Test of Adult Basic Education, Slosson Oral Reading Test, Writing Sample, Worksheets/ Quizzes, Tutor/Teacher Assessments, Student Self Evaluations, Anecdotal Data

Program Development Goals: (a) Refine Adult Basic Education and family literacy programs through collaboration with IBM, City College and the Boys and Girls Club of Chicago.

(b) Develop capacity to effectively assess and document non-quantifiable indicators of student progress and achievement.

(c) Develop follow-up system which will allow organization to monitor learners' progress after education program completion.

(d) Create a Student Advisory Board (to encourage increased learner participation in program planning and decision-making).

(e) Enhance staff development practices.

Parent-Child Development Center, Inc.
P.O. Box 30
West Point, VA 23181
(804) 843-2289

Executive Director: Patricia Carlton

The Parent-Child Development Center (PCDC), Inc. was founded in 1971 to address the needs of economically disadvantaged families living in a five-county area of rural southeastern Virginia. PCDC, which predominantly serves African American and Caucasian females and their children, employs a multi-faceted approach in providing services and programs to individuals and families. Its goals are to promote parents' self-sufficiency, support preschool children who are at-risk for school failure or developmental delays, enhance parenting skills and child care techniques, and provide on-going supportive services. Major components of the community-based organization's work include Head Start programs, a child development center, literacy and Adult Basic Education classes, and family services. The Center also provides home-based family education services and a seniors' program.

During the twenty-two years of its existence, the Parent-Child Development Center has become a valued resource for strengthening the community (serving families and non-parenting adults). It has taken leadership in supporting the work of local social service agencies and public school systems, has been recognized by the Virginia Department of Education for its comprehensive approach to promoting family learning and development, and has received positive evaluations by the College of William and Mary.

PCDC serves an area where over 60% of the adult population has not completed high school, and where over one-third of adults have less than an 8th grade education. Major community concerns include the lack of transportation, employment, and affordable, quality housing. During recent years, there has been an increase in incidences of domestic violence, drug dealing and other crimes, and in the number of crack-addicted babies being born. As well, PCDC staff report an increase in the number of dysfunctional families with mental health and other special needs being served by the Center.

The Parent-Child Development Center responds to the community through offering moral support, counseling and education. In addition to child development, basic education and parenting skills enhancement, PCDC provides social service information, assistance and referral. It does community outreach, conducts medical and dental screening, provides transportation assistance and a hot lunch program. Additionally, it supports families in addressing their housing needs and

advocates on behalf of individuals and families experiencing difficulty with obtaining health care and social services.

Before "family literacy" became a nationally recognized term to symbolize the concept of family learning and development, PCDC had devised a program model which promoted the academic and social skills enhancement of "the total family." Having always been concerned with parent and child development, PCDC had, essentially, been conducting a family and intergenerational literacy program for many years--using education as the catalyst for increasing families' chances to become self-sufficient. At PCDC, family literacy is separately and jointly parent- and child-focused. The organization's Adult Program Division--which encompasses all family literacy program components and services--is designed to "focus on the 'whole adult' and his/her family in order to help reduce or eliminate whatever barriers may [impede learning]." Service components include:

(1) Tri-County and Middle-Peninsula Head Start Programs (to increase preschool children's "social competence" to enable them to function effectively in their present environments, in school and life);

(2) Pinewood Child Development Center (to provide state-licensed, quality child care and promote the physical, social and emotional growth and development of all children according to their potential);

(3) Adult Education and Literacy (to increase basic skills competencies, science and social studies knowledge; improve life and parenting skills, and provide pre-employment education/training); and

(4) Family Resources Program (to provide group support, short-term supportive counseling, referral and advocacy assistance to enable families to solve problems).

The Parent-Child Development Center believes that, for the disadvantaged, family development requires the provision of comprehensive support services to reduce barriers which hinder the educational process. Literacy/basic skills enhancement is content-based, individualized and promotes the development of critical thinking and problem solving. In addition to remediating academic skills and preparing students to get their GED's, PCDC teaches parents how to observe, evaluate and foster their children's development. Learning is promoted as an "active process" which encourages ownership and responsibility, and builds social and leadership skills.

Adult learners identify several critical improvements (for themselves and their children) that have occurred since their enrollment at PCDC, including enhanced reading, writing, speaking and computing skills and increased self-confidence and responsibility in supporting the educational process of their children. They have learned fun and creative techniques for motivating their children to learn, have improved their social skills and are more comfortable seeking and receiving help.

With regard to their children's growth, parents report an increased enthusiasm for learning. They can see their children changing negative attitudes and behaviors which hinder their education. As well, children are approaching their parents more often to engage in joint reading activities and seek assistance with completing class assignments.

FAMILY/INTERGENERATIONAL LITERACY PROGRAM PROFILE

Program Name: Parent-Child Development

Direct Service/Intervention Focus: Parent/Child Combination

Program Length: 30 weeks (20-23 hours per week; re-enrollment option)

Major Support Services: On-Site Child Care, Child Care Assistance, Counseling, Provision of Learning Specialist, Emergency Assistance, Social Service and Other Community Support Agency Referrals

Staffing: Manager/Coordinator for Each Program Component (Mary Davis*, Adult Education/Literacy); ABE/GED Teachers and Teaching Assistants; Head Start Home Visitors, Center-Based Teachers and Assistants; Health and Family Services Coordinators and Aides; Child Development Lead Teachers and Assistants; Coordinator for School-Aged Children; Child Care Worker/Coordinator; Kitchen Manager; Family Resources Parent/Community and Other Volunteers

NOTE: Staffing specifications include all educational/developmental program components.

Special/Unique Features: (a) Four Component Family Literacy Program

(b) Family Reading Class

(c) Center- and Home-Based Family Education

(d) Family Resource Library (for family and staff use)

(e) Case Management System

Curricula/Skills Developed: Basic Skills, Parenting (modified Systematic Training for Effective Parenting/STEP curriculum), Pre-Employment, Family and Social Skills, High/Scope Curriculum (child development: critical thinking and problem solving)

Sample Activities/Approaches: (a) Providing Appropriate, Age-Specific Child Development Activities Which Promote Social, Physical, Cognitive and Intellectual Growth

(b) Assisting Parents with Increasing their Knowledge of Child Growth and Development

(c) Teaching Parents How to Encourage their Children to Observe and Analyze

(d) Providing Computer-Assisted Instruction for Basic Skills Learning and Reinforcement

(e) Organizing Parent-Child Playgroups to Encourage Family Interaction

Major Documentation: Personal Plans, Home Visit Progress Reports, Monthly/Quarterly/Annual Program Progress Reports (all components)

Assessment Instruments/Methods: Test of Adult Basic Education, GED Practice Tests, Teacher Evaluations, Student Self-Evaluations, Anecdotal Data

Program Development Goals: (a) Secure new facility for organization.

(b) Explore ways to offer extension programs (via satellite).

(c) Incorporate a job skills training program and enhance job-readiness component.

(d) Integrate cultural awareness/ enrichment activities as regular entities of program structure.

(e) Devise effective student progress monitoring system to increase organization's capacity to assess and document program impact.

(f) Implement staff training module designed to develop management potential of program coordinators.

Penn Community Services, Inc.
P.O. Box 126
Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive
Saint Helena Island, SC 29921
(803) 838-2432

Executive Director: Emory S. Campbell

Historically-based Penn Community Services (Penn Center), Inc.--which serves a predominantly African American population--was founded as Penn School in 1862 to provide formal education and other settlement assistance services to former slaves. The first school established for the education of freed slaves in the South, it "functioned as a normal, agricultural and industrial education institution until 1948." Penn Center's mission is "to preserve the Sea Island history, culture and environment through serving as a local, national and international educational resource center, and by acting as a catalyst for the development of programs for self-sufficiency." The Center carries out this mission by providing three major programs: History and Cultural Affairs, Land and Environmental Education, and Academic and Cultural Enrichment. It also conducts, in partnership with the University of South Carolina, an intervention program for at-risk families with small children, and sponsors an annual Heritage Day Celebration to present aspects of African and African American culture.

Of foremost concern to the low- to moderate-income African American residents of St. Helena island is maintaining the vast amount of land owned by their families. On the island, Black families tend to be close-knit, even building their homes in close proximity. Resort and tourist development, a growing industry surrounding the 20 communities that comprise St. Helena Island, has threatened to push families off their land--as well as move job opportunities away from the immediate area. To address these concerns, Penn Center functions as a community action resource, assembling residents to build awareness of and strategize against development plans which will result in family land loss. The Center's Land Use/Environment Protection Program is also a significant support service to land owners, providing counseling and education to families to help them understand and protect their legal rights, subdivide their properties in more appropriate ways, increase their productivity as farmers and locate markets for their produce. Additionally, the Center works closely with government officials to create local jobs through economic diversification.

In 1983, Penn Center began its Program for Academic and Cultural Enrichment (PACE). Targeted to Sea Island children from 6-13 years old, the program was designed to reduce the disproportionate rate of minority school failure by promoting academic achievement and the awareness of cultural heritage and

traditions. PACE features three components: after-school tutoring and homework assistance in science and math, language arts, history, computer science, etc.; a Saturday program which provides field trips to businesses, education centers, and exhibits; and a summer program which provides intensive tutoring and involves children in special projects which are culturally-based and often promote intergenerational exchange. Over the last five to six years, PACE has exposed over 500 children to the history and culture of African American Sea Islanders (i.e., religion, crafts, art, and the Gullah language passed through West African descent). The program has been recognized by the National Association for the Education of Young Children, and has provided a tutorial model which has been replicated in established centers in other locales of South Carolina.

During 1991, Penn Center received a grant from the Association for Community Based Education (ACBE) to expand PACE with a research-based intergenerational literacy project. The project, entitled "Participatory Research of Gullah Folktales," focused more attention on the Sea Island culture and the stories derived from ancient African lore that have existed for more than 200 years. Concerned that the Gullah language and fables would be lost with the demise of community elders, the Center proposed to train youth to retrieve, transcribe, translate and record the tales to share with other youth, scholars, researchers and educational institutions. Results of the project's first year were significantly similar to the Center's original goals. The intergenerational exchange between youth and elders expanded participants' cultural knowledge and communication skills. Interest from scholars and researchers to view the collected stories (which often presented a moral or were related to religious teachings) and participate in follow-up activities increased--and has continued to do so in the two subsequent years of the project. Additionally, participating elders gained a new sense of their importance as community educators.

Now in its third year, the project has helped learners increase their self-esteem and pride in their cultural heritage, promoted improvements in reading, written and oral communications and critical thinking skills, taught values and morals, and encouraged youth to respect their elders. Youth participants have learned the history and linguistic patterns of the Gullah language. They report that their exposure to culturally-based morals has increased their understanding of the values of former generations and how they may be applied today. They have become more involved in church activities, are more comfortable with public speaking, and have learned how to work as a team.

With regard to the elders, they feel that the project gives Sea Island seniors, who have little or no formal education, opportunities to "pass down" their knowledge of cultural tradition and history to younger generations, assist youth in

solving personal problems and developing standards for their lives.

FAMILY/INTERGENERATIONAL LITERACY PROGRAM PROFILE

Program Name: Program for Academic and Cultural Enrichment: "Participatory Research of Gullah Folktales"

Direct Service/Intervention Focus: Adult-Child (related and non-related)

Program Length: 52 weeks (15 hours per week, minimum)

Major Support Services: Transportation

Staffing: Program Coordinator (Walter Mack)
Youth Research Team
Advisory Council/Translation Team
Tutors/Counselors
Photographer

Special/Unique Features:
(a) Culturally-Based Program Model
(b) Research Conducted by Community
(c) Youth-Elder Exchange
(d) Active Participation of Youth
(e) Support Team of Experienced Translators

Curricula/Skills Developed: Basic Skills, Critical Thinking, Cultural Knowledge, Life Values and Morals, Youth Leadership, Research Methodology/Techniques

Sample Activities/Approaches:
(a) Learning History of Penn Center
(b) Becoming Familiar with Aspects of Gullah Language and Culture
(c) Learning How to Effectively Communicate with Elders
(d) Presenting Gullah Folktales Through Various Mediums (audio and video cassette tapes, live presentations, collages/photo

displays)

Major Documentation: Youth Academic Profiles, Research Data Worksheets, Recorded Gullah Folktales, Story Summary Sheets, Audio and Video-taped Presentations of Folktales, Program Progress Reports

Assessment Instruments/Methods: Academic Records from Public School, Public School Teacher Evaluations of Students' Skills, Parent Evaluations of Children's Skills, Tutor/Counselor Evaluations, Student Self-Evaluations, Anecdotal Data

Program Development Goals:

(a) Work collaboratively with younger public school teachers who are unfamiliar with the Gullah language and culture.

(b) Conduct a five-year longitudinal study (currently in progress) of PACE students attending public school to allow organization to better assess and document impact of program participation.

NOTE: Organizationally, Penn Community Services is preparing to conduct a Restoration Project to improve and develop new and existing programs, services and facilities.

Refugee Women's Alliance
3004 South Alaska Street
Seattle, WA 98108
(206) 721-0243

Executive Director: Judy de Barros*

The Refugee Women's Alliance (ReWA) is a non-profit, community-based mutual assistance association that supports refugee women in their goal to achieve economic self-sufficiency in America. Founded in 1984 by several successfully resettled refugee women, it has developed the capacity to serve more than 500 homebound Cambodian, Ethiopian, Russian and other refugee women and their families each year. ReWA offers three major service tracks: education, bilingual and bicultural social services, and training and consultation. Its service components include English as a Second Language (ESL) and family literacy classes, ESL tutoring, early childhood education, family counseling and crisis intervention. ReWA, which has received national recognition for its comprehensive services, is active--both locally and nationally--in advocating for the rights of refugee and immigrant women.

Probably the most prevalent problems faced by refugees and immigrants living in Seattle's southern region are the lack of English language proficiencies and the difficulties associated with adjusting to a new culture. Because of long-term needs for ESL education, participants of ReWA's programs (some of whom receive public assistance) fear that they will not be able to learn English well enough to obtain jobs or participate in job skills training programs within the period allotted by the Welfare System--resulting in the loss of financial support and benefits before the attainment of job readiness. Additionally, many community residents have housing needs, are concerned about their children's futures, and need support in dealing with anxieties caused by their separation from family and friends, understanding America's public school and social services systems, and maintaining their cultural identities and family units in an unfamiliar country.

ReWA responds to the needs and concerns of refugee women by providing education, counseling, employment readiness skills enhancement, job training and community service referrals. To accommodate students with varying English language skills, interests and needs, ReWA's ESL education component includes four classes: Pre-literacy, Even Start Family Literacy, Jobs ESL, and Family Talk Time. Participants requiring referrals for social services are aided through ReWA's expansive research and listing of family mental health resources, and refugee and immigrant services--including health care providers; mental health counseling; interpreters; early childhood education; housing, legal and emergency assistance; ethnic and refugee organizations

and support for victims of domestic violence.

The Refugee Women's Alliance offers two family literacy programs: Even Start Family Literacy (the program primarily profiled in ACBE's project) and Family Talk Time. Family literacy, which spans a period of more than six years at ReWA, is considered an essential part of the organization's overall mission. Originally called "community education," the family literacy components grew out of refugee mothers' needs to be knowledgeable about ways to effectively communicate with and educate their children. Even Start Family Literacy and Family Talk Time are structured in a complementary fashion--allowing persons in the first component to continue skills development in the latter. Both serve refugee and immigrant women who have small children, the Even Start segment accepting persons with reading skills below the eighth grade and Family Talk Time enrolling learners with advanced beginning level ESL skills. Each component incorporates ESL education with parenting skills and family development strategies, addressing such issues as health and safety, community resources, self-esteem, and American school education.

ReWA's Even Start family Literacy program is designed to support "the total family." Recognizing that parents are children's "first teachers," ReWA works to enhance the literacy and parenting skills of principal caregivers in an effort to strengthen the family unit. An integrated parent education literacy curriculum is followed, allowing parents to build English, basic education and critical thinking skills while exploring issues and learning techniques that will support their goal to parent more effectively. The program, which promotes multicultural sharing and collaboration and conducts optional home visits, serves as the "bridge component" between the Pre-literacy and advanced Family Talk Time ESL classes.

Similar to persons enrolled in ReWA's Family Talk Time program, participants in the Even Start Family Literacy program are encouraged by the progress they have made since enrolling. Although participation periods vary among refugee women, all report improvements in their understanding and use of English. They read and write English better, have improved their listening and parenting skills, and feel that they are better able to understand communications from their children's schools. Additionally, the women have noticed changes in their children--who are now more interested in learning and participating in social activities, "see their mothers in a new [and positive] light," have increased their self-esteem, and are making better grades.

FAMILY/INTERGENERATIONAL LITERACY PROGRAM PROFILE

Program Name: Even Start Family Literacy

Direct Service/Intervention Focus: Parents

Program Length: 10 weeks (12 hours per week; re-enrollment option)

Major Support Services: On-Site Child Care, Counseling, Language Interpretation, Tutoring, Social Services Assistance, Community Support Service Agency Referrals

Staffing: ESL/Volunteer Coordinator (Sue Wilkes)
Literacy Instructor
ESL Instructor
Parenting Instructor
4 Bilingual Aides
Child Care Workers
Volunteers

Special/Unique Features:

(a) Integrated Parent Education and Literacy Curriculum

(b) Six Component Skills Development Instructional Process

(c) Home- and Center-Based Instruction

(d) ESL and Family Literacy Resource Library

(e) Storytelling Project (native folktales)

(f) Preparation for Participation in Supplemental Language and Literacy Skills Development Component (Family Talk Time)

(g) Case Management System

Curricula/Skills Developed: English Education (ESL), Parenting Skills, Critical Thinking, Child and Family Development

Sample Activities/Approaches: (a) Modeling and Role Playing (building parent advocacy skills)

(b) Cross-Cultural Exchange (stories, poems, songs, games and other traditions)

(c) Practical Application of Skills

(d) Innovative Class Activities Which Support Students with Varied Educational Backgrounds, Learning Styles and Experiences

Major Documentation: Student Portfolios, Student Journals, Home Visit Reports, Case Management Notes, Monthly and Quarterly Program Progress Reports

Assessment Instruments/Methods: Basic English Skills Test, Student Self-Evaluations, Parenting Skills Assessments, Skills Worksheets, Teacher Evaluations, Anecdotal Data

Program Development Goals: (a) Enhance collaborative relationship with Seattle Central Community College (which provides ESL instructors for organization).

(b) Create system for monitoring and assessing progress of learners following completion of educational program/s.

(c) Develop employment skills training component (to be integrated with all of the organization's existing educational programs).

Tacoma Community House
Project Even Start and the Refugee Women's Project (RWP)
1314 L Street
P.O. Box 5107
Tacoma, WA 98405
(206) 383-3951 and 471-9582 (RWP)

Executive Director: Robert M. Yamashita

Tacoma Community House (TCH), a United Way agency affiliated with the General Board of Global Ministries of the United Methodist Church, is a non-profit community-based organization which supports persons of diverse ethnic and racial backgrounds. Founded in 1907, TCH has a long history of community service, assisting refugees and immigrants from more than 23 countries--as well as persons from various areas of the United States. In carrying out its mission to innovatively respond to the needs of persons of diverse ethnic backgrounds (especially refugees and immigrants--many of whom are of Asian origin), TCH provides many services and programs, including Adult Basic Education, family literacy programs, English as a Second Language (ESL) classes and tutoring, GED preparation, a job club and a recreation program. It additionally conducts a Volunteer Training Project, which serves approximately 25 programs which offer English language tutoring to refugees in Washington state, and an employment services component which supports low-income, limited English speakers in their search for jobs.

Although both are within the vacinity of housing projects, Tacoma Community House's family literacy programs (Project Even Start and the Refugee Women's Project) are located in different segments of the Tacoma/Pierce County area. As such, the community needs, problems and concerns differ. The community served by Project Even Start--which is populated by Caucasians, persons of Hispanic and Asian origins, African and Native Americans--is plagued by crime. There is a need for safe and affordable housing and employment opportunities. Persons on public assistance feel threatened by restrictions which limit the nature and amount of support they can obtain--which are based, to some degree, on their abilities to complete education and training programs within an allotted period.

The primarily Cambodian community served by TCH's Refugee Women's Project is most in need of English skills and affordable transportation. Persons in this community also lack employment. There is a considerable amount of domestic violence, gambling among teenagers, and the lack of English language proficiencies among community residents results in misunderstandings with police. Social service assistance and medical care are inadequate, and there are unaddressed mental health problems.

TCH's response to the communities' needs involves education, social service and advocacy. Through the organization's educational and employment assistance programs, outreach and mental health services, and commitment to understanding and improving the social conditions which affect community life, TCH works to provide appropriate interventions. These interventions --both formal and informal--include counseling for victims of domestic violence; community social service and medical care advocacy and referral; relocation and transportation assistance; home safety/emergency response, mental health, and parenting skills workshops and classes.

PROJECT EVEN START

Tacoma Community House's Even Start program, which has been in operation for nearly five years, is a state-funded program designed to assist parents in developing the skills they need to support their children in the learning process. The original Even Start model included two separate skills development components--one for limited English speakers and one for English speakers, with volunteer tutors working one-to-one with students to enhance their basic education skills. TCH staff found this model to be ineffective as it did not allow students with common backgrounds/experiences, interests and needs to interact. Cut-backs in funding forced the elimination of the component for English speakers. To accommodate the decrease in funding, TCH began utilizing its existing Adult Basic Education program to provide the academic skills building segment of the project. (NOTE: Today, the program primarily serves English speakers, while the Refugee Women's Project and other TCH educational components enroll persons with limited or no English skills.)

Structured as a learner-centered, parent-focused family literacy program, Project Even Start provides mechanisms through which adults can strengthen their basic education, life and parenting skills. Through building these skills, parents are empowered to assume their roles as children's "first teachers," and pursue further education and training that will ultimately allow them to gain employment and increase their chances of becoming self-sufficient.

To ensure that each student's educational needs are met, academic classes are provided at various levels (five for basic skills, pre-GED and GED instruction, and two for math). Project Even Start operates in an open-entry/open-exit mode. Students are given the option of accepting (or not accepting) their basic education skills level placements and may accept placements on a trial basis--creating a learning atmosphere which builds critical literacy skills, encourages freedom of choice, adult responsibility and decision-making.

THE REFUGEE WOMEN'S PROJECT

TCH's Refugee Women's Project (RWP), housed in the H.F.J. Cambodian Episcopal Church in Tacoma, provides ESL education (at three levels), parenting and survival skills enhancement. It has an on-site facility for preschoolers, who participate in activities to develop their motor skills, strengthen their sensory perception, and increase their school readiness. Similar to TCH's Even Start program, the RWP enhances family literacy through building the basic education skills of parents.

In its original format, the program included the provision of a larger staff and no structured opportunities for parents to interact with their children. Today, more focus is placed on family education and development. The program, which addresses the special needs of refugee and immigrant women (e.g., isolation, lack of self-sufficiency, limited understanding of local family resources and social support services, etc.) is the only one of its kind in the Pierce County area.

The Refugee Women's Project promotes parents' awareness of and response to the connection betweeen their educational ideals and development and those of their children. The program's primary goal is to increase parents' literacy and deter attitudes and behaviors that indicate a devaluing of education--which is often passed to children. RWP uses large and small group, learner-centered instruction, and encourages critical thinking and problem solving.

PROGRAM RESULTS

Participants of Project Even Start report improvements in several key areas. They are better readers and have strengthened their math and social skills. They are more positive about the educational process, have increased their self-esteem, and have more respect for their children's feelings. They are helping their children with homework more often, have learned how to play and communicate with their children, and are more knowledgeable about how to obtain social service assistance.

Adults in the Refugee Women's Project report the enhancement of life skills (e.g., reading directions, increasing home safety, making emergency telephone calls, and computing the correct change, etc.) as results of their program participation. Their children are learning how to read for enjoyment and showing indications of school readiness. Participants feel that their emerging understanding of American life and culture has enhanced their self-confidence. They now are more likely to help relatives and neighbors complete life skills-related tasks they have learned while in the program. Additionally, some of them are participating in community meetings--such as those sponsored

by the Cambodian Women's Association.

FAMILY/INTERGENERATIONAL LITERACY PROGRAM PROFILE

Program Name: Project Even Start

Direct Service/Intervention Focus: Parents

Program Length: 44 weeks (14-18 hours per week; open-entry/ open-exit)

Major Support Services: Child Care Provider/Transporation/ Emergency Assistance, Counseling, Tutoring, Community Support Service Agency Referrals

Staffing: Program Coordinator/Parenting Instructor (Mindy Popa)

NOTE: TCH's Adult Literacy Project staff support Project Even Start's basic skills education component.

Special/Unique Features: (a) Multi-Level Basic Skills Instruction

(b) Integration of Parenting and Basic Skills Education

(c) Case Management System

Curricula/Skills Developed: Basic Skills, Parenting and Life Skills, Nutrition Education, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving, STEP/ Systematic Training for Effective Parenting Curriculum or "How to Talk So Kids Will Listen" Learning Series

Sample Activities/Approaches: (a) Trial Program Placements (staff decisions made collaboratively with learners)

(b) Summer Parent Advocacy Class

(c) Sharing of Personal Life Experiences

(d) Participatory Group Learning and Problem Solving

(e) Student-Selected Writing Topics

(f) Cross-Cultural Exchange

Major Documentation: Program and State CBO Enrollment Forms, Student Journals, Teacher Journals, Case Worker Reports, New Word Lists and Reading Logs, Monthly/Quarterly/Annual Program Progress Reports

Assessment Instruments/Methods: Reading Evaluation Adult Diagnosis, Slosson Oral Reading Test, Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (as needed), Writing Sample, Learning Style Assessment, TCH-Developed Parent Survey, Student Self-Evaluations, Teacher Evaluations, Anecdotal Data

Program Development Goals: (a) Implement student portfolio assessment techniques for basic skills education component.

FAMILY/INTERGENERATIONAL LITERACY PROGRAM PROFILE

Program Name: Refugee Women's Project

Direct Service/Intervention Focus: Parent/Child Combination

Program Length: 10 weeks (12 hours per week; open-entry/ open-exit; re-enrollment option)

Major Support Services: On-Site Child Care and Development, Bilingual Support Staff, Counseling, Advocacy and Outreach, Community Support Service Agency Referrals

Staffing: Program Coordinator (Laurie Becker)
Bilingual Program Assistant/Outreach Worker
ESL Instructor
2 Child Care Workers (1 bilingual)
Bilingual Aide
Volunteer Program Assistant/Child Care Worker

Special/Unique Features: (a) Six Component Skills Development Program Model

(b) Multi-Level ESL and Parenting Skills Instruction

(c) On-Site Child Education and Development

(d) Program Design to Address Special Needs/Issues of Refugee Women

Curricula/Skills Developed: English Education (ESL), Parenting, Life and Survival Skills, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving, ReWA's Parenting Curriculum (modified), TCH-Developed ESL Curriculum

Sample Activities/Approaches:

(a) Culturally Sensitive Parenting Skills Enhancement

(b) Encourages Writing and Speaking in Whole Sentences Early in Language Literacy Education

(c) Weekly Parent-Child Interaction Activities

(d) Practical Application of Basic Skills in Daily Life Situations

(e) Sharing of Personal Life Experiences

(f) Age-Specific Language, Motor and Social Skills Development Activities for Children

Major Documentation: Coordinator's Journal/Activity Log, Service Referral Notations, Monthly ESL Program Reports, Monthly/Quarterly/Annual Program Progress Reports

Assessment Instruments/Methods: TCH-Developed ESL Placement Test, TCH-Developed Oral and Written Language Use Literacy Exams, Child Care Worker Notations, Teacher Evaluations/Notations, Anecdotal Data

Program Development Goals:

(a) Develop child education curriculum.

(b) Enhance documentation systems.

NOTE: Organizationally, TCH is working with the Pierce County Literacy Coalition to potentially develop a multi-service literacy agency which will oversee the coordination and delivery of all literacy education services, testing and assessment, resources, staff development and training programs for the county.

Whitley County Communities for Children
P.O. Box 733
Williamsburg, KY 40769
(606) 549-1964

Executive Director: Marian Colette

Whitley County Communities for Children (WCCC) is a non-profit organization that provides support to predominantly Caucasian, low-income families who seek to improve the quality of their lives. Incorporated in 1985, the organization was established through the efforts of a group of community mothers who were concerned about the health care needs of other women, their infants and young children. A multi-service agency, WCCC conducts a maternal-infant health outreach and assistance program, and provides child care; family resource referrals; recreational, educational and community development activities for children and parents; pregnancy/school drop out prevention and young adult parenting programs; Adult Basic Education and GED preparation; family literacy; and a community small farms enterprise project. WCCC is solely operated by community residents--many of whom have been served by its programs.

Although there are a number of problems to be overcome in Whitley County, the most prevalent include the lack of significant economic development opportunities, a high public school drop out rate, lack of transportation, and limited adequate housing. Many community residents feel "trapped" by an area which offers little support for achieving economic self-sufficiency. Although willing to participate in education and skills training programs designed to improve their abilities to compete in the job market, residents are often hindered by the scarcity and limitations of local jobs (e.g., coal mining, farming, and the lumber industry). For poor families with no resources to relocate to more economically developed urban areas, the future seems bleak.

Whitley County Communities for Children supports its community through education and information dissemination. In addition to providing assistance to the county through training and support service interventions, WCCC encourages community action and advocacy. Believing that people should be educated about their rights in order to take the necessary steps to improve their lives, WCCC sponsors special presentations and workshops on such topics as the rights or welfare recipients, health care and insurance, choosing quality child care services, social and community service programs and entitlements.

In September 1990, WCCC received a grant from the Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy to begin its "School-on-Wheels" family literacy program. Because of the lack of transportation characteristic to low-income rural communities,

WCCC proposed to operate a mobile school that would travel to specific county areas (within a 100-mile radius) to provide child care assistance, parenting skills, adult basic and preschool education. A large (30 ft.) RV motorhouse was purchased and, in October of the same year, WCCC began the Family and Child Education (FACE) program, serving five locations--with plans to extend service to a sixth.

Today, FACE has school sites in three Whitley County locations--the result of a consolidation of geographic service areas. It encourages the early education of children to promote school readiness and provides opportunities during each session for parents and children to engage in separate and joint activities designed to address specific education and developmental needs, define personal goals, and/or increase self-esteem. FACE, which values parents as their children's "first teachers," works to improve the basic education and parenting skills of adults, enabling the "intergenerational transfer" of literacy and development of self-concept.

Because many of the parents desire to obtain their GED's, emphasis is placed on building reading, writing and math skills, with some content knowledge enhancement in science, social studies, literature and the arts. Children engage in activities which enhance their artistic abilities, build reading, oral communication and social skills, and increase self-awareness and -worth.

FACE uses a learner-centered educational approach; includes a variety of learning resources to improve basic education, parenting and critical thinking skills; and encourages leadership skills enhancement. Students meet in small groups and have individualized learning plans in order to accommodate the variations in skills levels, learning styles, and special needs.

Parents report that, since their enrollment in WCCC's Family and Child Education program, they have improved their basic education skills (especially in math and writing)--which they see as necessary for competition in the labor market, and have developed their social skills. They are able to help their children learn, can discipline and communicate with their children better. They report that their children read better, seem healthier and happier, and are more confident. Additionally, parents have increased their participation in community activities, even supporting WCCC in its efforts to raise funds by making items for arts and crafts fairs.

Adults relate that the program works because it approaches education through first helping students overcome a critical barrier: lack of transportation. They feel totally supported by the program--both by staff (with whom they share similar personal experiences) and each other.

FAMILY/INTERGENERATIONAL LITERACY PROGRAM PROFILE

Program Name: Family and Child Education

Direct Service/Intervention Focus: Parent/Child Combination

Program Length: 52 weeks (2-3 hours per day; re-enrollment option)

NOTE: Some participants are concurrently enrolled in WCCC's formal ABE/GED classes.

Major Support Services: Transportation Assistance, Child Care Assistance, Community Support Service Agency Referrals

Staffing: Program Coordinator (Beverly Woliver)
Instructors (paraprofessionals)
Volunteer Tutors

Special/Unique Features:
(a) Operates Mobile School ("School-on-Wheels")
(b) On-Site Child Education and Development
(c) Integration of Parenting and Basic Skills Education

Curricula/Skills Developed: Basic Skills, Parenting, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving, Child Development and Education (social, language and reading skills)

Sample Activities/Approaches:
(a) Intergenerational Sharing and Learning
(b) Practical Application of Basic Skills in Daily Life Situations
(c) Discussion and Writing about Personal Life Experiences
(d) Children Identifying Personal Qualities which Contribute to Their "Specialness" as Individuals
(e) Children Reading, Listening to and Discussing Stories

Major Documentation: Family Goals Checklists, Family Update Interview Forms, Family Files, Toddler Group Summaries, Program Progress Reports

Assessment Instruments/Methods: Test of Adult Basic Education (locator), Slosson Oral Reading Test, Family Literacy Checklist, Student/Family Self-Evaluations, Toddler Group Evaluations, Anecdotal Data

Program Development Goals:

(a) Incorporate cultural awareness/ enrichment activities into curriculum.

(b) Develop system to monitor and assess progress of former learners.

(c) Enhance collaborative relationship with local literacy council (to improve integration of services).

APPENDIX G:

SAMPLE PROGRAM DOCUMENTS

NOTE: These sample documents are being considered for inclusion in ACBE's forthcoming publication, Documenting Your Worth.

Form 1
FAMILY INTAKE

FAMILY PLACE LOCATION: _____
FULL NAME: _____
D.O.B: ____/____/____
AGE: _____

Person completing form: _____ (Worker's ID #)

1. First time served? ☐ Yes ☐ No

2. _____
Family # (3 digits) *Year* *Case # (3 digits)* *Indexed participant*
01 Mother ☐ 02 Father ☐ 09 Other ☐ 11 Child 1 ☐ 12 Child 2 ☐ 13 Child 3 ☐ 14 Child 4 ☐ 15 Child 5 ☐ 16 Child 6 ☐

3. Date of intake: ____/____/____

4. Date case became active: ____/____/____

5. Name of indexed participant to put in file: (First name of participant) _____
(Participant's father's last name) _____
(Participant's mother's last name) _____
(Participant's partner's/spouse last name) _____

6. Gender ☐ Male ☐ Female

7. Current address: Number, Street, Apt. # _____
County, City, State, Zip Code _____

8. Telephone number: ( )_____ - _____

9. Address/phone number of close relative: Telephone number ( )_____ - _____
Name _____
Relationship _____
Number, Street, Apt. # _____
City, State, Zip Code _____

10. Name of persons at intake, relationship:
Name *Relationship to indexed participant*
a. _____
b. _____
c. _____
d. _____
e. _____

11. Marital status: ☐ Married ☐ Separated ☐ Accompanied ☐ Widowed ☐ Divorced ☐ Single

12. Spouse/accompanier's name (at intake): _____

13. Age: _____

14. Do you think he would like to be involved in Family Place? ☐ No ☐ Yes Hours/days: _____
Why not? _____

15. Who referred you to Family Place *(Check one only)*: ☐ Agency _____
☐ Current participant _____ ☐ Former participant ☐ Self
☐ Mary House ☐ R St. Clinic ☐ Upper Cardozo ☐ Adams Morgan -CC ☐ Adams Morgan -A
☐ Spanish Catholic Center ☐ Elizabeth House ☐ Ayuda ☐ Children's Hospital ☐ Change Inc.
☐ Clinica Del Pueblo ☐ Mary's Center
☐ Other _____

16. Reason for referral (as stated by referral source) *(Check all that apply)*:
☐ Prenatal ☐ Money ☐ Domestic violence ☐ Day care ☐ Supports
☐ Food ☐ Shelter ☐ Child maltreatment ☐ Parenting ☐ ESL/Literacy
☐ Other _____ ☐ Don't know

17. What do you need from Family Place? *(As stated by participant)*:
☐ Prenatal ☐ Money ☐ Domestic violence ☐ Day care ☐ Supports
☐ Food ☐ Shelter ☐ Child maltreatment ☐ Parenting ☐ ESL/Literacy
☐ Other _____ ☐ Don't know

18. Race/Ethnicity (as defined by indexed participant) *(Optional)*:
18a. *Race* ☐ Black ☐ White ☐ Morena/o ☐ Other _____
18b. *Ethnicity* ☐ Native American ☐ African American ☐ African ☐ Hispanic ☐ Other _____

19. Country of origin: ☐ USA ☐ Peru ☐ Chile ☐ Mexico ☐ Panama ☐ Guatemala ☐ Nicaragua
☐ Honduras ☐ Uruguay ☐ Bolivia ☐ Colombia ☐ Argentina ☐ Paraguay ☐ Venezuela ☐ El Salvador
☐ Puerto Rico ☐ Costa Rica ☐ Haiti ☐ Rep. Dominicana ☐ Other _____

20. How long have you been in the US? _____ Years _____ Months

21. How long in the Metropolitan Area? _____ Years _____ Months

EDUCATION

22. What is your primary language? ☐ Spanish ☐ English ☐ Other _____

23. If English is NOT your primary language, how well do you speak it? *(As defined by participant)* ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐ None

24. Have you attended school in any country? ☐ No ☐ Yes
Elementary _____ years High School _____ years Middle _____ years College _____ years
Special training *(specify)*: _____

25. How are your reading/writing skills? ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐ None

26. Are you currently going to school? ☐ No ☐ Yes Where? _____

FINANCIAL

27. Are you currently working? ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ Part time night ☐ Part time day ☐ Full time night ☐ Full time day
What kind of a job is it? ☐ Domestic worker ☐ Maintenance worker ☐ Clerical ☐ Secretary
☐ Restaurant/Hotel ☐ Babysitting ☐ Sales person ☐ Beautician
☐ Other: _____ How long: _____ (months)

28. Have you ever been employed in the U.S.? ☐ No ☐ Yes
What kind of a job? ☐ Domestic worker ☐ Maintenance worker ☐ Clerical ☐ Secretary
☐ Restaurant/Hotel ☐ Babysitting ☐ Sales person ☐ Beautician
☐ Other: _____ How long: _____ (months)

29. What kind of work did you do in your country? _____

30. Is your spouse currently working? ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ Part time night ☐ Part time day ☐ Full time night ☐ Full time day
What kind of a job is it? ☐ Cleaning/Janitor ☐ Hotel worker ☐ Restaurant ☐ Construction
☐ Other: _____ How long: _____ (months)

31. What is your family income per week? Estimate: _____ ☐ (0-100) ☐ (101-250) ☐ (251-500) ☐ (>501)

32. Are there family members abroad for whom you are responsible?
32a. ☐ Yes Relationships: _____ ☐ No
32b. How many persons live from this income? _____

33. Are you applying for/Do you have? ☐ Work permit ☐ Political asylum ☐ Amnesty ☐ Relative's sponsorship
☐ None ☐ Other: _____

34. Social Security Number: ☐ Yes #_____-____-_____ ☐ No

35. Do you currently receive assistance from *(Check all that apply)*: ☐ SSI ☐ Medicaid ☐ AFDC ☐ Food stamps ☐ WIC
☐ Other: _____

HOUSING

36. What is your current living arrangement? ☐ Own apartment/house ☐ Rent room in house/apartment ☐ Rent apartment/house
Public shelter: _____ Private shelter: _____
Other: _____

37. How many people live in the same house with you? _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

38. Is there more than one family living in the household? ☐ No ☐ Yes

39. What is the condition of your living arrangement? *(Judgement made by participant)*

☐ Adequately housed ☐ Inadequately housed Why? _____

MEDICAL CARE

40. Are you pregnant? 40a. ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ Unsure 40b. How many months? _____ Due date: _____/_____/_____

40c. Do you have prenatal care provider? ☐ No ☐ Yes Name: _____

41. When was your first prenatal appointment? _____ Month _____ Year

42. When was your last visit? _____ Month _____ Year

43. Do you have another visit scheduled? ☐ No ☐ Yes When: _____/_____/_____

44. Do you plan to breastfeed? ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ Unsure

45. Are there other medical/health agencies that you use? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Names: _____

What is the reason you are attending or have attended these health agencies? _____

_____

HEALTH STATUS

46. How many times have you been pregnant? _____

47. What were the outcomes? _____ Live birth _____ Miscarriage _____ Elective abortion _____ Stillborn

48. How many are still living? _____

49. Current health of participant *(Self report)*: ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

50. Any diseases/illnesses? ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ Diabetes ☐ High blood pressure ☐ Venereal disease ☐ Anemia
☐ HIV (+) ☐ Tuberculosis ☐ "Nerves" _____
Other: _____

51. a. Do you drink alcohol? ☐ No ☐ Yes How much/frequency: _____
b. Does he drink alcohol? ☐ No ☐ Yes How much/frequency: _____

52. a. Do you consume drugs? ☐ No ☐ Yes Specify: _____
b. Does he consume drugs? ☐ No ☐ Yes Specify: _____

53. a. Do you smoke any cigarettes? ☐ No ☐ Yes Specify: _____
b. Does he smoke any cigarettes? ☐ No ☐ Yes Specify: _____

54. a. Are you taking any medications? ☐ No ☐ Yes Specify: _____
b. Did the doctor prescribe them? ☐ No ☐ Yes
c. Are they from abroad? ☐ No ☐ Yes Specify: _____

55. Why are you taking the medications? _____

_____

56. Intake assessment of emotional distress: Based on observations at intake, is there any indication of emotional distress? ☐ No ☐ Yes

☐ Incoherent speech ☐ Memory lapses ☐ Time/space confusion ☐ Anxiety (hands, shortness of breath, sweat, exaggerated response to stimuli)
☐ Excessive crying ☐ Apathetic ☐ Contradictory information
☐ Suicidal thoughts ☐ Flat affect ☐ Self preoccupied ☐ Other: _____

SOCIAL SUPPORT

57. Do you have family members living in the U.S.? ☐ (0) No ☐ (1) Yes Where (what states)? ☐ (1) DC ☐ (0) Other
Relationship: _____

58. How often do you see family/friends? ☐ (3) Weekly ☐ (2) Once in a while ☐ (1) Almost never ☐ (0) Never

59. How often do you talk to family/friends on the phone? ☐ (3) Weekly ☐ (2) Once in a while ☐ (1) Almost never ☐ (0) Never

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

60. Do you talk to someone about things that worry you? ☐ (0) No ☐ (1) Yes Who: _____

61. Does your spouse or companion help you? ☐ (0) No ☐ (1) Yes ☐ House work ☐ Transportation ☐ Childcare ☐ Money

62. Does anyone help you in the house? ☐ (0) No ☐ (1) Yes

63. Whom would you go to in an emergency? (Check all that apply) ☐ Spouse ☐ Neighbors ☐ Family members ☐ Friends
Agency (specify): _____ ☐ Don't know

64. Do you attend church? ☐ (3) Weekly ☐ (2) Once in a while ☐ (1) Almost never ☐ (0) Never

65. With which other agencies you had personal contact? *(Recite list of referring agencies and write in score):* _____

66. SOCIAL SUPPORT INDEX: _____ *(Computer generated)*

CHILDREN

67. How many children do you have? _____

68. How many children do you have living abroad? _____

69. How many children do you have in the U.S.? _____

Name of child (first-last)	*D.O.B.*	*Age*	*Gender*	*Relationship*	*Special needs*

Pediatric care provided by: (for children under 36 months)

Child name	*Clinic*	*Pediatrician*

INTAKE PERSON IMPRESSIONS

70. Intensity code (level code assigned): ☐ I ☐ II ☐ III

71. Reason for intensity: _____

72. Immediate needs: ☐ Prenatal care referral ☐ Health referral (other) ☐ Shelter/Housing ☐ Legal service ☐ Food ☐ Clothes ☐ Transportation ☐ WIC ☐ Medicaid ☐ Parenting ☐ Translation ☐ Completing form ☐ Counseling
Immediate services provided: ☐ Prenatal care referral ☐ Health referral (other) ☐ Shelter/Housing ☐ Legal service ☐ Food ☐ Clothes ☐ Transportation ☐ WIC ☐ Medicaid ☐ Parenting ☐ Translation ☐ Completing form ☐ Counseling

73. Other needs: _____

74. Next meeting at Family Place with: _____ Date: ____/____/____

75. Case assigned to: _____ Date: ____/____/____

76. Intake review by: _____ Date: ____/____/____

77. Data entry by: _____ Date: ____/____/____

REFUGEE WOMEN'S PROJECT
Tacoma Community House
On-Site: 1427 E. 40th St.
Mail to: P.O. Box 5107
Tacoma, WA 98415
(206) 471-9582

CHILD CARE REGISTRATION

_____
Date Enrolled

1. Child's Name(Last, First)_____ Name Called_____

2. Address(Street)_____

(City,State,Zip)_____

3. Parent's Name_____

Parent's Address(if different)_____

4. Phone_____ 5. Sex_____ 6. Child's DOB_____

7. With whom does child live?_____ 9. Size of Family_____

10. Other than you, who has permission to remove your child from the center?

Name_____ Relationship to Child_____ Phone_____

Name_____ Relationship to Child_____ Phone_____

Name_____ Relationship to Child_____ Phone_____

11. Who MAY NOT have access to your child?

Name_____ Relationship to Child_____ Court Order?_____

Name_____ Relationship to Child_____ Court Order?_____

ABOUT YOUR CHILD

PHYSICAL INFORMATION:

12. Is your child toilet trained?_____ How much help does s/he require?_____

WP51\CC-REG92.RWP

13. Does your child normally have toileting accidents?_____When?_____

14. Date of last physical exam?_____Next one due?_____

Physician's Name_____ Phone_____

SOCIAL INFORMATION:

15. Has your child been with other children?_____When?_____

16. Has your child ever been in daycare before?_____If yes, how long?_____

17. What kinds of play toys does your child enjoy?_____

18. Has your child ever been separated from you for more than 3 days?_____Why?_____

How did s/he adjust?_____

19. Does your child use a special comforter during stressful or tired times?_____What?_____

20. What makes your child happy?_____

How does your child show happiness?_____

21. What makes your child sad?_____

How does your child show sadness?_____

22. What makes your child angry?_____

How does your child show anger?_____

23. What makes your child frightened?_____

How does your child show fear?_____

I authorize Refugee Women's Project Child Care to provide care for my child. I certify that the information I have provided is correct to the best of my knowledge. Refugee Women's Project Child Care is required by law to report all instances of suspected child abuse to child protective services. I understand this provision is to protect my child and the agency.

Parent/Guardian Signature_____Date_____

WP51\CC-REG92.RWP

Examiner: _____ Date: _____

ORAL EXAM

Personal Information

Ask Questions 1 - 4 to fill in the box below.

Name _____

Country of Origin _____ Age _____

Current Occupation _____ Former Occupation _____

How long in U.S.? _____ years _____ months

_____ 1. What's your name? Where are you from?
_____ 2. How old are you?
_____ 3. Are you working? What is your job? OR What was your job in _____ *(student's country)*
_____ 4. How long have you been in the United States?
_____ 5. Who did you come with?
_____ 6. How did you get here today?
_____ 7. Tell me about a holiday in your country. *This item tests the student's ability to carry on a conversation about a familiar topic. You may ask follow up questions, i.e. "What do you eat?", but student's reply must be more than one or two words. Conversation should flow with a minimum of hesitancy.*

Shopping

___ 1. *Point to the shirt the man in holding up in Picture A.* What is this?
___ 2. *Point to the woman.* What is she wearing?
___ 3. Where are they?
___ 4. One T-shirt costs $5. How much do 7 T-shirts cost?
___ 5. The jackets are on sale. They are half price today. How much is one jacket?
___ 6. *Point to Picture B.* What's wrong with this chair?
___ 7. *Point to Picture C.* I want to buy a car. Which one should I buy? *This item tests the student's ability to persuade. Student must give you at least three reasons with minimal prompting, i.e. "Why else?" or "Tell me more."*

Community

1. *Point to Picture D.* Where is the market?
2. Where can I buy stamps?
3. How many cars are there?
4. Is the post office next to the hospital?
5. *Point to NO RIGHT TURN sign in Picture E.* What does this mean?
6. *Point to Picture F.* What's the matter? What can he do?
7. Do you live in a house or apartment? How do I get there from here? *You may rephrase or clarify so that student understands the question, i.e. "Give me directions to your house" or "I want to drive to your house. What should I do?" Directions may be for walking, driving, or taking the bus, but must be clear and complete.)*

	Score	Level
ORAL		
LITERACY		

M U 5 24 11

f 8 k 16 92

men tap call lock
pen top fall luck
ten tip hall lick

LITERACY EXAM

Level 1A

Name _____ Age _____

Address _____

_____

M u 11 . 5 . 24

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____

men pen ten	tap top tip	call fall hall	lock luck lick

Level 1B

WOMEN POISON TELEPHONE STOP BUS

The man is at home. He is not working now. It is 3:00. The man has three children. The children are at school.

1. Where is the man?

2. What time is it?

3. Is the man working now?

Level 2

▸ Circle the telephone number for Nancy Hathaway.

HATFIELD A.....	633-8943
Brian L 8345 51st N.....	624-1019
Richard 502 32st SW.....	525-9087
T 1004 Univ.....	937-7296
Wayne	281-9155
HATHAWAY DM.....	367-8834
Gloria 2209 E Jefferson.....	324-4773
Howard C.....	448-1965
N E 420 Blanchard.....	782-4999
Nancy 5133 Roy.....	232-9502
Norman L6208 36th S.....	527-1743
Steven F.....	323-0091
HATLEY Eric P 314 Holly.....	932-4731
Michael W 454 Oak.....	529-1105
Roger & Edna.....	772-9630

▸ Fill in the blanks with the best word.

Anna and Tran are students. They are Studying English. They wanted to _____ dinner for some friends. They went to the _____ to buy some food. Anna got some _____ and Tran got some coke to _____. When they went to pay for the food, they _____ have enough cash. Tran had to _____ a check. The cashier _____ to see his I.D. He gave the _____ his driver's license.

Level 3

▸ **Read the sign.**

COMPANY SAFETY RULES

1. All employees must wear closed shoes. Open shoes are not allowed.
2. All kitchen employees must wear hairnets.
3. Be alert. It is dangerous to work when you are sleepy or tired.
4. Never drink alcohol on the job or before you come to work.
5. Smoke only in approved areas.
6. Report all accidents to supervisor immediately.

▸ **Draw a line between the words that mean the same thing.**

employee	O.K.
immediately.	awake, not sleepy
alert	worker
allowed	tell
report	quickly, right away

▸ **Answer the questions.**

Who must wear hairnets?

Can you smoke at work?

Why is it dangerous to work when you are sleepy?

PERSONAL PLAN OF ACTION WORKSHEET

1. I want to achieve the following goals:_____

_____

2. What could keep me from reaching this goal?

_____I don't really have the skills, ability and/or knowledge needed.

_____I don't want it badly enough to really work for it.

_____I'm afraid that I might fail.

_____I'm afraid of what others might think.

_____Others don't want me to reach this goal.

_____The goal is really too difficult to ever accomplish.

Some other reasons might be;_____

_____

3. What are some things I could do so the above things don't prevent me from reaching my goal?

_____

_____

4. Who can help me?

Name:	Kind of help:
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. What are my chances for success?

	Why do I feel this way?
_____Very Good	
_____Good	_____
_____Fair	_____
_____Poor	_____
_____Very Poor	_____

6. What are some of the good things that might happen if I reach this goal?

_____

_____

Used by the Parent-Child Development Center (source unknown)

7. What are some of the bad things that might happen if I reach this goal?

_____

_____

8. What are the chances that the bad things would happen if I reached the goal?

_____Very High

_____High

_____50/50

_____Low

_____Very Low

What could be done to reduce the odds?

_____

_____

_____

9. Do I still want to try to reach this goal?

_____Yes

_____No

_____Undecided

10. What are some first steps I could take to reach this goal?

_____

11. What else must I do if I am really to succeed?

_____

_____

12. Am I going to take the above steps?

_____Yes

_____No

_____Still Undecided

13. If my answer to No. 12 is Yes, I make the following self-contract.

SELF-CONTRACT

I, _____, have decided to try to achieve the goal of _____. The first step I will take to reach this goal will be to _____ by _____. My target date for reaching this goal is _____.

DATE_____ SIGNED_____

WITNESSED BY_____

NAME _____ DATE _____ PROGRAM_____

DATE OF INITIAL PLACEMENT _____ REVIEW DATE _____

PRE-EVALUATION DATE _____

_____ _____

Entry level (specify weaknesses Special Consideration or Comments

_____ _____

STUDENT GOALS

STUDY AREA

IMPROVE READING SKILLS

(OBJECTIVES)

1.
2.
3.

STUDY AREA

IMPROVE MATH SKILLS

(OBJECTIVES)

1.
2.
3.

IMPROVE LANGUAGE SKILLS

(OBJECTIVES)

1.
2.
3.

IMPROVE SCIENCE SKILLS

(OBJECTIVES)

1.
2.
3.

(ESSAY WRITING)

1.
2.
3.

STUDENT NAME _____

NAME OF TUTOR _____

DATE OF SIGNATURE _____(student)

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

Whitley County Communities for Children

MATERIALS USED

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

EVALUATION USED DATE _____

TABE

OTHER PRE/POST TEST

_____

HOMEMADE TEST

OBSERVATION

HAS STUDENT COMPLETED OBJECTIVES ? Y N

Progressing in LEVEL ? STUDY AREA

_____

MATERIALS USED

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

EVALUATION USED DATE _____

TABE

OTHER PRE/POST TEST

_____

HOMEMADE TEST

OBSERVATION

HAS STUDENT COMPLETED OBJECTIVES ? Y N

PROGRESSING IN LEVEL ? STUDY AREA

_____

MATERIALS USED

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

EVALUATION USED DATE _____

TABE

OTHER PRE/POST TEST

_____

HOMEMADE TEST

OBSERVATION

HAS STUDENT COMPLETED OBJECTIVES ? Y N

PROGRESSING IN LEVEL ? STUDY AREA

MATERIALS USED

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

EVALUATION USED DATE _____

TABE

OTHER PRE/POST TEST

_____

HOMEMADE TEST

OBSERVATION

HAS STUDENT COMPLETED OBJECTIVES ? Y N

PROGRESSING IN LEVEL ? STUDY AREA

LEARNER'S GOALS

GERMANTOWN WOMEN'S EDUCATION PROJECT

Name: Date:

Already Accomplished	Goal for this Session	Future Goal	NO Interest	Academic Needs	Evaluation and Comments
				Reading:	
				Math:	
				Writing:	
				Specific Subject:	
				GED TESTS:	
				Literature & Arts:	
				Math:	
				Social Studies:	
				Science:	
				Writing Skills:	
				Job Related Needs:	Evaluation and Comments
				Career Options:	
				Fill Out Job Application:	
				Write a Resume:	
				Read Want Ads:	
				Type/Use Computer:	
				Improve Interview Skills:	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Already Accomplished	Goal for this Session	Future Goal	NO Interest	Social/Community Needs	Evaluation and Comments
				Political Issues/Candidates:	
				Register to Vote:	
				Driver's License:	
				Library Card:	
				Economic Needs	**Evaluation and Comments**
				Budget/Organize Finances:	
				Open/Manage Bank Account:	
				Comparison Shop/Use Coupons:	
				Complete Tax Return:	
				Self-Development Needs	**Evaluation and Comments**
				Keep Journal	
				Draw/Paint/Sing:	
				Jog/Swim/Walk/Aerobics:	
				Plant Garden:	
				Read to Reduce Stress:	
				Walks in Parks/Countryside:	

Already Accomplished	Goal for this Session	Future Goal	NO Interest	Family Related Needs	Evaluation and Comments
				Fun/Edu. Activities for Children:	
				Discipline/Set Limits with Child:	
				Improve Child's Self-esteem:	
				Deal with School Sys. for Child:	
				Family Counseling Resources:	
				Alcohol/Drug Treatment Resources:	
				Physical/Sexual/Emotional Abuse Resources:	
				Housing/Utility Bill Resouces:	
				Health Care Needs	Evaluation and Comments
				Dental:	
				Vision:	
				Gynecological:	
				Pre-natal:	
				Women's Health Care Issues:	
				Increase Ability to Handle Stress:	

Community Action, Inc. of Hays, Caldwell, and Blanco Counties (Workforce Instructional Network)

Goals List

Name:_____Date:_____Interviewer:_____

I. In your own words, can you tell me your reasons for coming to school now?

_____

_____

_____

II. Here are some goals other students in this program have mentioned. Tell me if this is something you already can do, something you would like to do, or something you really have no interest in.(Check appropriate section.)

	Can Do	Would Like to Do	Not Interested In
Personal			
Read/write your name and address			
Read signs			
Read labels/Instructions			
Read/write notes to/from family			
Read/write shopping lists			
Read a calendar, bus schedules, TV guides			
Use a phone book			
Read maps			
Read information related to health			
Fill out forms			
Read/wirte personal letters			
Read the newspaper			
Read magazines			
Use a dictionary			
Improve handwriting			

	Can Do	Would Like to Do	Not Interested In
Children			
Help Children Grow			
Read to your children/grandchildren			
Take part in school-related meetings and events			
Talk with child's teacher			
Work			
Fill out a job application			
Use reading to find out about jobs			
Create a Resume			
Use reading to learn to do your job better or open a business			
Read and write notes from to co-workers			
Read or wirte work reports, logs, nnouncements			
Fill out order forms/lists			
Participate in work-related meetings; take Notes			
Practice interviewing skills			
Consumer Math			
Read Bills			
Write Checks			
Understanding Loans/Charge Cards			
Understanding Taxes			
Understanding Sales Discounts			
Community			
Register to vote			
Apply for citzenship			
Read leases/contracts			

	Can Do	Would Like to Do	Not Interested In
Apply for a library card			
Take the driving test			
Participate in community meetings/clubs			
Join a group to work on a problem			
Publish a newsletter or other writing			
Books and Writing			
Read books for enjoyment (Circle Kind-adventure,mystery,romance, historical,books about people)			
Read books to get information (Circle Kind-personal research,current events, jobs,children, health,religious, hobbies,entertainment)			
Write for yourself (Circle kind- journal or diary, experiences you've had,advice for others, your opinions, reports about something you've read, your life story or autobiography, other stories, poems,words to songs)			
Education			
Attend a job training program			
Attend classes to learn something new (hobbies, self-improvement)			
Pass a work-related test			
Get a GED			
Prepare for College			
Prepare for Vocational Training			

III. Can you think of any other goals you have which we have not mentioned?

IV. Of all the goals we have mentioned, name two or three which are most important to you right now.

V. Do you think it is easy or hard to learn new things? What makes you think that?

VI. What are your plans after you finish this class?

Comments:

THE NEIGHBORHOOD INSTITUTE
LITERACY PROGRAMS
STUDENT AGREEMENT

There are several things that I would like to accomplish in life. I know that in order to obtain may goals and objectives, I must plan and take steps to make these things happen.

My 3 short term goals are:

1. _____

Steps I will take to complete Goal #1 by _____.

2. _____

Steps I will take to complete Goal #2 by _____.

3. _____

Steps I will take to complete Goal #3 by _____.

My 2 long term goals are:

1. _____

Steps I will take to complete this long term goal by _____.

2. _____

Steps I will take to complete this long term goal by _____.

I know my achievements and success will depend on the time, planning and energy that I put forth.

_____ _____

Signature Date

BES PARENT LOG

Directions: The BES Family Literacy Project staff are interested in finding out about some of the things you do at home. Please read all items first and then complete this form as carefully as possible. If you are not sure about an item, ask your BES teacher for help.

Today's Date: ____/____/____ Are you a: ☐ Male or ☐ Female
Day Month Year

How old is your child? _____

Yesterday, at home I: (Check [ ] all that apply)

[ ] a. read aloud to my child for_____minutes
[ ] b. told a story to my child
[ ] c. listened to my child read
[ ] d. helped my child with homework
[ ] e. helped my child choose a book to read
[ ] f. helped my child with a problem (about school, friends, etc.)
[ ] g. talked to my child about what happened in school
[ ] h. played a make believe kind of game with my child
[ ] i. played a game that had rules with my child
[ ] j. spoke to my child's teacher
[ ] k. visited my child's school
[ ] l. attended a parent meeting at my child's school
[ ] m. took my child to the library
[ ] n. checked out reading material from the library
[ ] o. took my child out (e.g., to the movies, to a store, to a restaurant, etc.)
[ ] p. had a discussion with my child about an important social, issue e.g., alcohol/drug use, the homeless, AIDS, crime, etc.
[ ] q. praised my child for something
[ ] r. taught my child how to protect him/herself (e.g., from crime, drugs, alcohol, AIDS, etc.)
[ ] s. taught my child manners
[ ] t. taught my child how to do something around the house (e.g., cook, wash or dry the dishes, wash clothes, fix something, etc.)
[ ] u. read the newspaper for_____minutes
[ ] v did some reading from a book (please give title:_____)
[ ] w. wrote a letter to a friend or relative

PARENT SURVEY - PROJECT EVEN START 1992-93
TACOMA COMMUNITY HOUSE

Student's Name _____

Entry Date _____ Today's Date _____

Circle the number that tells how true each sentence is about you right now.

1 = FALSE, 2 = sometimes FALSE, 3 = I have mixed feelings, 4 = sometimes TRUE, 5 = TRUE

		False		?		True
1.	I feel good about my parenting skills.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	I know how to help my child feel good about him or herself.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I know what I can do to feel better about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	I use positive self-talk.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	I encourage my children to use positive self-talk.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I know how to set goals for myself and work on them.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	I know the difference between encouragement and praise.	1	2	3	4	5
RELATIONSHIPS		False		?		True
8.	I know how to tell my children what I really need and want.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	I know how to tell my friend or partner what I really need and want.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	I show my love for my children in many ways, besides hugs and kisses.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	I know how and what to teach my children about the male reproductive system (sex education).	1	2	3	4	5
12.	I know how and what to teach my children about the female reproductive system (sex education).	1	2	3	4	5
13.	I feel okay talking about sex and sex issues with my children.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	I feel okay talking about sex with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5

HEALTH & SAFETY		False	?			True
15.	I know the signs of most STDs (sexually transmitted diseases).	1	2	3	4	5
16.	I know how to keep myself from getting AIDS and STDs.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	I know how to answer my children's questions about AIDS and STDs.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	I know where to get help for myself or my children if we are abused by someone, sexually or physically.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	I know where to get help for myself or my children if we need mental or emotional help.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	I teach my child how to be safe and smart about strangers to prevent kidnapping and sexual abuse.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	I am certified in CPR.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	I know how to tell what makes the stress in my life.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	I know how to get rid of some of the stress in my life.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	I know how to handle stress in a healthy way.	1	2	3	4	5

COMMUNICATION		False	?			True
25.	I know what attentive listening is.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	I use attentive listening with my children.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	I use "do" messages instead of "don'ts" whenever I can.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	I tell people my feelings through I-messages.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	I show the way I want my children to speak to me and others by the way I speak to them.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	I think about my "body talk" when I talk with my children or with others.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	I encourage my children with kind words.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	I know where my anger comes from.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	I know how to let my anger out in healthy ways.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	I know how to handle my child's anger in healthy ways.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	I let my children solve most of their own problems.	1	2	3	4	5

36.	I ask my children to help solve some family problems.	1	2	3	4	5

FUN AND LEARNING		False		?		True
37.	I spend special time alone with each of my children every day, if possible.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	My family has a library card(s) and we use it at least once a month.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	I know how to use the library near me.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	I know how to choose books for my children.	1	2	3	4	5
41.	I read books for my own enjoyment whenever I can.	1	2	3	4	5

Dover Adult Learning Center
22 Atkinson Street
Dover, New Hampshire 03820

DOVER ADULT LEARNING CENTER, 22 Atkinson Street, Dover, NH 03820 Telephone:742-1030

STUDENT ATTENDANCE Class_____ Teacher_____

TERM_____19___ X=Present A=Absent 1/2=Partial absence of 20 minutes or more

PLEASE SUBMIT TO DOVER ADULT LEARNING CENTER OFFICE PROMPTLY AT THE END OF EACH MONTH. PLEASE CONTACT THE OFFICE AT ONCE WHEN A STUDENT FOR CREDIT ACCUMULATES MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE ABSENCES:_____

NAME DATES	PHONE	CREDIT FOR X=CREDIT	DATES																						
1.																									

Dorcas Place Parent Literacy Center

Request for Student Follow-up/Support Services

Name:_____ Program: _____ Date: _____

Referral Request (reasons):

_____ student late for classes

_____ student has been absent or has irregular attendance

_____ student has day-care problems

_____ student has transportation problems

_____ student has financial/public assistance problems

_____ other. Explain : _____

_____

_____

Requestor's signature: _____

Name of Social Worker Assigned: _____

Follow-up:

Counseling/referrals (summary):

1.____ medical
2.____ housing
3.____ utilities
4.____ legal aid
5.____ day care
6.____ mental health
7.____ emergency shelter
8.____ food stamps
9.____ other public assistance
10.____ food
11.____ pathways
12.____ transportation
13.____ financial counseling
14.____ substance abuse
15.____ clothing
16.____ other _____

Recommendations (additional follow-up required?): _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Social Worker's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Dorcas Place Parent Literacy Center

STUDENT STATUS CHANGE FORM

Name:_____ Current Program:_____ Date:_____

____ **Request for Student Transfer** Date of request:_____
Reason:_____
_____
Recommendation:_____
Requestor (Signature):_____ Approved (Y/N) _____

____ **Student is being transferred to another Dorcas Place program**
Name of new program:_____ Start Date:_____

____ **Student is being referred to program outside Dorcas Place**
Type of program: ____Voc/Tech ____GED ____JTPA
Other:_____ Start Date:_____
Confirmation Date _____ Follow-up/Progress (incl. program name, address, phone #, contact person): _____
_____
_____

____ **Student entered employment** Start Date:_____
Dorcas Place placement? ____yes ____no
Employer name:_____ Phone #:_____
Address:_____
Job category:_____ Benefits?____ yes ____ no
____Full time ____Part time Hourly Rate: _____
Confirmation date _____ Follow-up/Progress:_____
_____
_____

____ **Other Termination** (reason for leaving) Date:_____
____ daycare ____ housing ____ transportation ____ needs employment
____ medical ____ lost interest other:_____
____ Termination Requested by Teacher Reason: _____
_____
Requestor Signature: _____
In case of student dismissal from agency, authorizing signature:
_____ Co-Director Follow-up: _____
_____
_____

WIN Formative Evaluation Form

Name_____ Week of_____

1) The best thing about class this week was_____

_____

_____

2) Pick one sentence to complete:

This week, I learned_____

_____

_____That was important because_____

_____

_____

This week, I didn't really learn anything important. Next week, what needs to happen so I can learn something useful is_____

_____

_____

3) The one thing I would like to change about class this week is_____

_____

_____

4)Other comments, gripes,suggestions,questions, etc.?_____

_____

_____

Dorcas Place Parent Literacy Center

PROGRAM:_____ DATE:_____

STUDENT SURVEY

Classroom/Program Questions:

1. Were your class hours convenient? Yes No _____

_____

2. Do you feel you have enough time each day in the classroom? Yes No

Would you like to see class hours extended? Yes No _____

3. Were the books and other materials used in the classroom helpful? Yes No _____

_____

4. Were there enough books and other materials available for your use? Yes No _____

_____

5. Describe your goals for participating in this program: _____

_____

6. Do you feel the subjects you are studying are relevant to your goals? Yes No _____

_____

7. What subjects/information would you like to see your teacher spend more time on? _____

What subjects/information would you like to see your teacher spend less time on? _____

8. How do you feel about the progress you have made in this class? _____

9. Do you feel you received enough help from your teacher during class? Yes No. _____

_____

10. Do you feel your teacher is effective in explaining things to you? Yes No; if not, why not? _____

_____

11. How do you feel about the size of your class and the number of students? _____

12. Do you feel you have enough time to work on the computer each week? Yes No. _____

13. During class, do you ever work with other students and exchange helpful information? Yes No

14. Do you feel that you have input in planning what is discussed in class and class activities? Yes No _____

_____

15. Do you have input into what materials are used in class? Yes No _____

Other/General Questions:

16. Have you attended workshops in addition to your classes? Yes No.

Did you find the workshops relevant to your life? Yes No. _____

17. What other kinds of workshops would you like to see at Dorcas Place, if any? _____

_____

18. Have you ever sought help from a Social Worker at Dorcas Place? Yes No If not, why _____

_____

19. Were the Social Workers available at convenient times? Yes No _____

What types of activities outside of class would you like to be involved in at Dorcas Place? _____

If you have already been involved in extra activities, please describe. _____

20. What do you think about the Student Council;is it a good idea? Yes No

_____

21. Overall, how do you feel about the services you received and the work you've done at Dorcas Place? _____

_____

22. Would you encourage friends or relatives to attend Dorcas Place. Why or why not?

_____

Other Comments:_____

_____

_____

THE NEIGHBORHOOD INSTITUTE LITERACY PROGRAMS
INSTRUCTOR/VOLUNTEER TUTOR
Student Assessment

Please read each item. Place an X under YES or NO for each.

	YES	NO
1. Has there been notable progress with your student this week?	____	____
2. Was this progress noted in:		
Reading	____	____
Math	____	____
Comprehension	____	____
Vocabulary	____	____
Writing skill	____	____
Oral expression	____	____
Other (please list)	____	____
_____		
_____		
_____		
3. Are you aware of student's goals?	____	____
4. Are these realistic (obtainable) goals for this student?	____	____
5. Would you recommend using different -		
Educational materials	____	____
Teaching strategy	____	____
6. Has student mentioned a special problem that may interfere with learning/progressing? If yes, please explain.	____	____
_____		
_____		
7. Has student mentioned personal gains/ accomplishments? If yes, please explain.	____	____
_____		
_____		
8. Have you observed any notable change in student's behavior this week? Or do you wish to share notable antedotes that may have occurred?	____	____
_____		
_____		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROGRAM FOR ACADEMIC AND CULTURAL ENRICHMENT
TEACHER'S EVALUATION PACE
1992/1993 ACADEMIC YEAR

NAME _____ YEARS IN THE DISTRICT ____

SCHOOL _____ GRADE LEVEL____

Please Circle answers

DO YOU FEEL THAT YOUR PUPILS HAVE BENEFITED FROM THE PACE PROGRAM?

Culturally yes or no

Socially yes or no

General behavior / Conduct yes or no

Academically yes or no
if yes where have improvements occurred?

language yes or no
science yes or no
math yes or no

DO YOU FEEL THAT YOUR PUPILS BENEFIT OVERALL FROM PARTICIPATION IN THE PACE PROGRAM? YES OR NO

WILL YOU CONTINUE TO RECOMMEND THAT STUDENTS PARTICIPATE IN THE PACE PROGRAM? YES OR NO

DO YOU FEEL THAT YOU HAVE OTHER PUPILS WHO COULD CURRENTLY BENEFIT FROM THIS PROGRAM? YES OR NO
If yes approximately how many? _____

THE NEIGHBORHOOD INSTITUTE
PACT (Family Literacy Program)

EVALUATION

Name_____ Date_____
Child(ren)'s Name(s) & Age(s):_____

1. Which PACT activities did you and your family participate in?

2. Which one did you and the family like best? Why?

3. Which one did you learn the most from?

4. What is something fun or creative that you did with your family after a PACT activity?

5. How do you help your child(ren) to be successful in school?

6. What do you need in order to help them more?

7. What is something about the program that needs to be improved?

8. What is the best thing that has happened in the PACT program for you and your family this year?

9. Would you tell someone about this program? Why? Why not?

10. Have you observed a positive change in your child(ren)'s behavior, grades, attitude, cooperative nature?

We would like to know how you feel about certain aspects of this program. Please rate the following on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means excellent and 1 means poor.

	POOR				EXCELLENT
Places visited	1	2	3	4	5
Staff/Volunteers	1	2	3	4	5
Resources/materials	1	2	3	4	5
Children's classroom space	1	2	3	4	5
Overall	1	2	3	4	5

INSTRUCTIONS: It is important that this form be filled out by an interviewer (otherwise, the li
of the student would affect the answers). Explain that this is not a test but a means for the s
help evaluate the program. There are no right or wrong answers - it is their opinion that is v
not necessary to solicit comments, but ones that are spontaneously given can be included on the

STUDENT EVEN START EVALUATION

STUDENT:_____

INTERVIEWER:_____

	NO or NOT MUCH	SOME or A LITTLE	YES or A LOT	COMMENTS (if given)
1. In the Even Start classes I have learned new skills to help me teach my children.				
2. I liked the special projects that we did in class for or about my children.				
3. I have learned new things about health and nutrition that help me take care of my children.				
4. I have learned new things about my child's behavior (why he/she acts the way he/she does at his/her age).				
5. I know what developmental skills are appropriate for my child's age (e.g. language, gross motor, small motor).				
6. I think my child's skills have developed in the last six months.				
7. I have learned new things about how Americans discipline their children.				
8. I know where and how to get help when I have a problem with my child.				

	NO or NOT MUCH	SOME or A LITTLE	YES or A LOT	COMMENTS (if given)
9. I am able to spend 1:1 time with my child (children).				
10. I spend time with my child				
-playing together				
-doing projects together				
-watching children's TV programs				
-teaching my child new things				
-reading to my child				
-other:_____				
*11. My child and I are getting along better than we were 9 months ago.				
*12. My child is getting along better with other children than he/she was last fall.				
*13. My child likes school better than when he/she started.				
14. I feel o.k. about visiting my child's classroom.				
15. I feel o.k. about talking to my child's teacher.				
16. I attended a parent/teacher conference this year.				

*Students should feel free to not check an answer here and indicate in "Comments" that this has an area of concern to them (e.g. "My child and I have always gotten along well")

17. I learned more reading in the Even Start class.

18. I learned new math skills in the Even Start class.

19. I have learned to write better.

20. I have new ideas about what I want for myself and my children.

21. I feel I can make some good choices for me and my family.

NARRATIVE QUESTIONS: (Please write in answers g

22. When you finish Even Start, what do you

23. Do you think over all that the Even Star

24. What did you like most in the classes?

25. What didn't you like in the classes?

26. What would you like to study more?

27. Was the childcare at ~~SEAWA~~ RewA important to

28. Is there anything else that would have h

29. Did it help to have bilingual aides?

30. Do you want to say anything else about E

ne

.

ices

answers given by the students)

t do you want to do?

Even Start class has helped you? How?

lasses?

sses?

ore?

rtant to your coming to class?

ld have helped you come to class every day?

ides?

e about Even Start?

Dorcas Place Parent Literacy Center

TEACHER SURVEY

Name: _____ Date: _____

Program: _____

1. Do you feel you have adequate supplies and materials for your program?

2. Do you feel you have sufficient time for planning, preparation, reporting, and record-keeping, student re-testing and evaluation (please respond in each area)?

3. What do you feel are the strengths of your particular program?

4. What do you feel are areas of weakness in you program, and what improvements do you recommend?

5. What changes would you recommend in the design and content of your program?

6. Do you have a sufficient number of aides/volunteers in your classroom? Are they adequately trained/prepared/qualified to be of benefit to you and your students?

7. What number of volunteers/aides is ideal in your classroom? _____

What special skills/interests should these aides have? _____

_____

8. Do you feel you have adequate space and an appropriate teacher:student ratio to be effective in the classroom?

_____

_____

_____

9. What is you overall-impression of the rate of student progress in your program this year? What have been the contributing factors?

_____

_____

_____

10. What do you feel are the most significant barriers to student progress and program completion?

_____

_____

_____

11. Do you feel you have access to and participate in adequate staff training opportunities during the year? What specific areas of training do you feel would benefit you and your program now?

_____

_____

_____

Other Comments: (If you feel this questionnaire overlooked any issues you would like to address, please do so here.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

CHANGES TO CURRICULUM

Class 1

Group games should be the last activity of the evening. Include one more traditional Indian game. Also include games which allow people to get to know one another: likes/dislikes, favorite things, etc. Also include a reading activity at the beginning of the class.

Class 3

Possibly replace Activity 2 with something else. The children enjoyed it but there was too much cutting in this lesson. I also think there is a better activity to replace it with.

Class 4

Find a replacement activity for Activity 3. Activity 3 takes a lot of time, may want to change it to a family tree exercise. Many class sessions need to be devoted to Family Histories and Family Books.

Class 5, 6, 7

The Parenting, Communication, Emotions and Role Modeling classes should be taught in separate groups to the parents and children. Parents and children should be broken up into separate groups in which the same material is covered but at different levels, the material should be fun and useful. Time should be allowed for the family to come together for activities toward the end of each class.

Curriculum will need to be found or developed for these topics, parts of previous classes may still be used and revised.

Class 8

Allow more than one class for this activity. Give each family the option of building the traditional home which their tribe utilized in the past or of choosing one they want to build. Also more time is needed for the writing activity. More discussion on what home is and means is also needed. Spend at least two class sessions on this topic.

Class 9

Might want to change the last activity to preparing traditional Native American recipes as a class and continue to discuss the

contributions of Native Americans to food. May also want to include medicinal plants and herbs in the discussion. This class took a lot of time, spend at least two class sessions to ensure that everything gets covered.

Some of the activities may be too difficult for 2-5 year olds, find other activities for them which correspond to the class topic.

Survey Questionnaire
Spring 1992
(draft for phone contact)

Employment

1. Have you looked for a job since you left DP? Yes ___ No ____

   If yes:
   -Have you had an interview? Where?
   -Were you hired?

   If no:
   -Are there barriers to you looking for work?

2. For those who have found work:
   -Part Time or Full Time?

   -Where?

   -What are your duties?

   -Approximate salary? (give range consistent with intake questionnaire)

3. Have you enrolled in any voc training?
   -Where?

   -For how long?

   -What kind of training?

   -Did you complete program?

Education

4. Have you attended any other educational program since leaving DP?
   Yes ___ No ____

   If yes:
   -Where? -Did you complete program?
   -How long?

If no:

-Are there barriers to you enrolling?

-Are you considering enrolling in the future?

5. Have there been other positive changes in your life since leaving DP?
   Examples:
   a) Do you feel that you are better able to help your children with their school work?

   b) Do you think that you are a better parent since attending school?

   c) Do you feel better about yourself since attending school?

6. Comments

DORCAS PLACE PARENT LITERACY CENTER, INC.

INTER-AGENCY LINKAGES AND COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS: 1993-94

Cranston Adult Learning Center (CALC): We have sub-contracted with CALC to deliver the planned pre-vocational and career exploration counseling and instruction for students in our Pre-GED and GED programs. CALC has had 20 years experience in providing adult education and vocational training programs for single parents, displaced homemakers and homemakers.

JTPA / other Vocational Training Programs: Because students enter our Basic Literacy Program with such low skill levels, they are not ready to participate in many of the programs offered under JTPA and the Carl Perkins Act. However, our students may be promoted from our Home-based or Intermediate Level Programs, to either our pre-GED/ pre-vocational program, "Bridging the Gap", which is funded under the Carl Perkins Act, or to our GED-level program, which is funded through DHS/Project Opportunity.

Upon completion of "Bridging the Gap", or our GED program, students are then referred to "Project Sphere" at the Community College of RI, E.O.C. of Rhode Island, Cranston Adult Learning Center, JTPA and other adult vocational training programs. Annually, a small percentage of students in the home-based program do GED-level work and/or enroll in an agency-based GED program. GED testing services are provided through the Educational Opportunity Center of RI.

RI College School of Social Work: RI College places BSW interns at Dorcas Place during the academic year, to provide casework and social services referrals for students. This relationship has been in place for the past 6 years, and has been critical to facilitating student enrollment and retention in programs. The interns now receive in-house supervision from a MSW social worker hired by Dorcas Place.

RI Department of Human Services Pathways To Independence Program: Dorcas Place has been identified by the Department of Human Services Pathways to Independence Program as a primary referral source for adult literacy education for their client population. We are in our third year of a purchase-of-service agreement for education and ancillary services to for 50 Pathways clients per year.

RI Adult Academy: Dorcas Place and the RI Adult Academy (Brown University) have been jointly funded through ACTION for VISTA outreach workers to assist with the student outreach, recruitment and follow-up activities of our agencies. Our current outreach worker is a recent graduate of the GED program at Dorcas Place.

Volunteers in Action, Inc.: Dorcas Place is one of five local agencies targeted by VIA to receive special technical assistance in identifying and meeting our various volunteer needs. VIA received a National Significance Grant which will fund this technical assistance project for the next year.

Genesis School: Dorcas Place and The Genesis Center have an affiliation agreement for the purpose of sharing resources where possible and for making cross-referrals of clients. The Genesis School provides ESL Literacy and GED preparation to new immigrants and refugees, especially Hispanics and Southeast Asians. This agency is located within 3 blocks of Dorcas Place.

The lack of affordable day-care continues to be a major barrier to enrollment/retention in adult education programs. Therefore, we are beginning to explore the feasibility of a collaborative neighborhood day-care to be shared by Genesis Center, Providence Family Learning Center and Dorcas Place.

Parent/Child Education and Inter-generational Literacy Program: During FY 1991 Dorcas Place expanded its present Parent/Child Education program by introducing a structured inter-generational literacy component, modeled after the Handel/Goldsmith Family Reading Program (New York). Our Parent/Child Educator has presented this program at the following agencies: The Women's Center, Eastman House, Talbot House, Children's Friend and Service, Hartford Park Community Center and DaVinci Center.

Women's Prison - Adult Correctional Institution: Dorcas Place and the Rhode Island Women's Prison have a cooperative agreement, whereby, our Maternal Health Coordinator provides classes at the ACI in pre-natal care and parenting skills for pregnant and parenting inmates.

Providence Public Housing Authority: We are entering our third year of a purchase-of-service contract with the Providence Housing Authority, to provide adult literacy and GED-level instruction, at Dorcas Place, targeting residents of public housing developments throughout Providence. PHA recruits applicants who then receive intake, testing, assessment and placement in one or more of our component programs through the GED level. Student transportation to Dorcas Place is provided by the PHA. For FY 1993 and FY 1994, PHA has designated Dorcas Place as their education vendor to provide education services for their residents under the RIDE Gateway Grant Program.

RI Department for Children, Youth and Families: Dorcas Place now has an agreement with DCYF, providing parenting and maternal health instruction at Dorcas Place, for targeted clients referred by the DCYF program.

Providence School Department: Dorcas Place will be entering its third year of a purchase-of-service contract with the Providence School Department, to provide basic literacy, GED and parenting instruction to parents of children enrolled in targeted Chapter 1 schools. This program is part of a US Dept. of Education Even Start grant. In addition, two Dorcas Place students this past year in a School Department program called the Providence TNT (Training, Nurturing, Teaching) Project. As a result, they have been trained to work with our parents as Parent Aides.

University of Rhode Island: Faculty from URI are presently engaged in a one-year staff development program for Dorcas Place teachers in the areas of teaching math, reading and reading comprehension to adult learners. Selected workshops are also open to other RI adult education agencies.

APPENDIX H

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Association for Community Based Education (formerly the Clearinghouse for Community Based Free Standing Educational Institutions). Coming Home: Commuity Based Education and the Development of Communities. Washington, D.C., 1979.

_____. Standards of Performance for Community Based Educational Institutions. Washington, D.C., 1983.

_____. **Adult Literacy: A Study of Community Based Literacy Programs** (program findings and profiles), vols. 1 and 2. Washington, D.C., revised September, 1986.

Auerbach, Elsa R. "Toward a Social-Contextual Approach to Family Literacy." Harvard Educational Review, vol. 59, no. 2 (May, 1989): 165-181.

Brizius, Jack A. and Foster, Susan A. Generation to Generation: Realizing the Promise of Family Literacy. Sponsored by the National Center for Family Literacy. Ypsilanti, Michigan: High/Scope Press, 1993.

Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center. **The Mechanics of Success for Families: An Illinois Family Literacy Report (Family Literacy Programs, Report No.1).** Rantoul, Illinois, 1990.

Jackson, Gregg B. **ACBE Evaluations of Community Based Literacy Programs.** Washington, DC: Association for Community Based Education, 1989.

Lancaster, Alden. **An Introduction to Intergenerational Literacy.** Washington, DC: Wider Opportunities for Women, Inc., 1992.

Somerfield, Benita. Optimal Programming. In Literacy and the Marketplace: Improving the Literacy of Low-Income Single Mothers. New York: Rockefeller Foundation, 1989.

Stein, Sondra G. Framework for Assessing Program Quality: A Community Based Approach to Literacy Program Evaluation. Washington, DC: Association for Community Based Education, 1993.

Sterling, Richard. Toward a Model of Alternative Assessment. In Literacy and the Marketplace: Improving the Literacy of Low-Income Single Mothers. New York: Rockefeller Foundation, 1989.

U.S. Department of Education: Office of Vocational and Adult Education. **Model Indicators of Program Quality for Adult Education Programs.** Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, July 1992.

Van Fossen, Sandra and Sticht, Thomas G. **Teach the Mother and Reach the Child: Results of the Intergenerational Literacy Action Research Project.** Washington, DC: Wider Opportunities for Women, Inc., 1991.